

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1408689

BALLARD: BRITAIN JUSTIFIED

D
639
R4
B24



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA



BRITAIN JUSTIFIED

THE WAR
FROM THE
CHRISTIAN
STANDPOINT



FRANK BALLARD, D.D.

BRITAIN JUSTIFIED.

The War from the Christian Standpoint

BRITAIN JUSTIFIED.

D
G39
R4
B24

THE WAR from the Christian Standpoint

By

FRANK BALLARD

D.D., M.A., B.Sc. (Lond.), F.R.M.S., &c.

AUTHOR OF

'Haeckel's Monism False,' 'Theomonism True,' 'The True God,' 'Christian Essentials,' 'Does it Matter what a Man Believes?' 'New Theology,' "'Guilty"—A Reply to "Not Guilty," "The People's Religious Difficulties,' "Eddyism"—A Delusion and a Snare,' 'Determinism—False and True,' 'The Miracles of Unbelief,' 'Why does not God Intervene?' 'Why Not Modern Unbelief?' &c.

London

CHARLES H. KELLY

25-35 CITY ROAD, AND 26 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

First Edition, 1914

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| INTRODUCTORY | 7 |
| I.—THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO <u>WAR</u> IN GENERAL | 15 |
| II.—CHRISTIANITY AND THE PRESENT WAR . | 55 |
| III.—THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIAN PEOPLE AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES DURING THE PRESENT CRISIS | 118 |
| BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING . | 142 |

BRITAIN JUSTIFIED.

The War from the Christian Standpoint

INTRODUCTORY

IN face of the flood of books, papers, magazines, letters, and pamphlets, which is being poured out on the subject of the present European Armageddon, it savours of presumption for any individual who is avowedly no military or political expert, to set forth his views for the consideration of the community at large. Seeing, however, that all cannot possibly go to the front, it is open to any one who is compelled to stay at home, to endeavour in some other fashion to contribute his mite towards the maintenance of truth and right, justice and charity, as the only way in which war's horrors may be brought to an everlasting end. It is certain that no mere series of military victories, on either side, can provide guarantee for a future of universal peace. The old song is still true, that

Cannon balls may aid the truth,
But words are weapons stronger.

If they are to be 'strong enough one day,' then something more potent than the vaunted 16in. Krupp gun, or the 'favourite' French 75mm. weapon, will have to come into action. Hence the

multitudinous papers and booklets, articles, and discussions, which are now viewing the whole dire situation from every standpoint that military training, political acumen, social sympathy, and national enthusiasm can suggest. This is all to the good. A public opinion is being formed which, one cannot but believe, is, in general, making for righteousness and peace. So much indeed has already been said on the lines just indicated, that it is not proposed here to add thereto. Leaving the military, political, national, and international issues to other agencies, as far as possible, the purpose of these pages is to face frankly and carefully, though in brief compass, all that is honestly visible from another standpoint which is confessedly most of all influential, but equally delicate and difficult. There are those, we know, who in such a national crisis as is now upon us, would leave out, or rule out of account, all reference to religion. But they are comparatively few, and their reiterated suggestion that Christianity is moribund, has about as much truth in it as the German infatuation that British virility was 'decadent.' Christianity was never so real, or influential, or widespread, as now, and there are abundant reasons for believing that when the present fearful calamities are overpast, something analogous to the atmospheric cleansing which follows physically in the wake of a great storm, will come to pass morally and spiritually throughout Christendom. Now, at all events, this is called—not wholly without reason—a 'Christian country.' There are in our midst thousands of avowedly Christian churches, and millions of 'professing Christians.' Even

virulent unbelievers like Mr. Blatchford acknowledge the immeasurable potency of Christian influence. He writes :—

The Christians have virtual command of all the churches, universities, and schools. They have the countenance and support of the Thrones, Parliaments, Cabinets, and Aristocracies of the world; and they have the nominal support of the world's newspaper press. They have formidable allies in the shape of whole schools of philosophy and whole libraries of eloquence and learning. They have the zealous service and unswerving credence of millions of honest and worthy citizens, and they are defended by solid ramparts of prejudice and sentiment and obstinate old custom.¹

It strikes one, in passing, that it is rather a large order to call upon us to believe that all the minds and hearts and lives and characters here contemplated, are poor deluded, misguided fanatic believers in a Jesus who never existed—followers of a religion which is ‘false from beginning to end.’ That, however, has been sufficiently dealt with elsewhere, and may be left now with the single remark that no credulity on earth is equal to that of the unbelief which so suggests. The point here is that there are in the Great Britain of to-day untold millions of Christians who desire to be at once good citizens and true patriots, but who are troubled beyond measure, staggered in mind, depressed at heart, as they survey the awful scenes of blood which mid-Europe is now exhibiting. In proportion as their faith is sincere, they cannot forget the dire fact which adds immeasurably to

¹ *God and My Neighbour*, p. 149.

the colossal tragedy, that nearly all the nations embroiled in it are, at least nominally, Christian. The whole modern world, believing and unbelieving, is confronted with the dumbfounding spectacle of the bloodiest war this earth has ever witnessed, being waged between avowed followers of 'the Prince of Peace,' even whilst they themselves allege that He came to establish for all humanity a kingdom whose essence should be 'righteousness, and peace, and joy' for evermore. Tennyson told us with tragic truth that

There is something in this world amiss
Shall be unriddled by-and-by.

But this overwhelming complication of miseries, which is involving the wholesale slaughter of earth's noblest children, together with the breaking of hearts and blasting of homes beyond all calculation, cries aloud for unriddling now, and that in such a way as shall prevent the recurrence of any curse like it as long as the world shall last.

It is small wonder, indeed it is quite inevitable, that all the enemies of Christian faith should find here supreme opportunity for sneers. Scoffing is always easy, but it must be owned that appearances seem in this case to justify it. Yet appearances are poor guides to truth, and only a moment's fair consideration is required to show that in the present instance, as so often, the scoffer merits either blame or pity for his superficiality. The warring nations are indeed nominally Christian, but it is luridly manifest that the nominal may be as far from the real as gilt is from gold. If real Christianity encouraged, or permitted, such a welter of

blood and tears, it would deserve all the execration its foes heap upon it. But when Mr. Coulson Kernahan writes—

That nations do lose their senses, that the blood-lust and the war-lust still continue, under certain conditions, to possess even Christian nations, I sorrowfully agree,

one must earnestly disagree with such an estimate, for the truth's sake. No Christian nation ever was, or ever can be, possessed by 'war-lust.' One might as well speak of the day as being possessed by the night. It is the fact that nations are not Christian, which makes the 'blood-lust' possible; just as our physicians tell us that it is the absence of vitality, when we get 'run down,' that handicaps the phagocytes in our veins, and leaves us an easy prey to the disease germs with which civilization strews our daily path.

Nor can we refuse to hear the question which is put sometimes with even brutal bluntness, 'What is the good of your Christianity at all, if it permits such unmitigated wrongs to be carried on, and such infernal cruelties to be perpetrated?' 'Why,' shouts the Hyde Park Secularist, 'does not Christianity put an end to war for ever?' And it catches the ear of the unthinking crowd, although the straightforward and sufficient reply is so close at hand. Why not? Because human nature will not let it. All the commonplace gibes at Christian history are met in the same way. There has really never been any 'Christian history,' simply because there has never been a Christian nation, or a Christian city. The so-called history of the Christian Church affords some of the most direful

reading in literature. Christianity has never yet been tried. And for the one sufficient reason that men and women have refused to try it. Europe to-day is no more really Christian than China or Japan. What we call 'Christendom' is but a vast aggregate of people, a few of whom are Christians. Even Mr. Blatchford, in the midst of his only too true diagnosis of the situation four years ago in the *Clarion*, exclaimed—'If only we were all Christians!' But we are not. And the tragedy of past ages has only culminated in the present holocaust, because a nominal faith must ever fail, alike to prevent the evil or accomplish the good which the real would do. Readers of R. L. Stevenson's immortal story of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* will call to mind how the fearful conclusion came to pass, simply because the original recipe for the wonder-working medicine was lost, and the imitation would not act. So, too, it would seem that Professor Seeley, in his no less remarkable *Ecce Homo*, gives us the clue once and for all to the disappointments which men have alleged in Christian history and influence.

We are to remember that nothing has been subjected to such multiform and grotesque perversion as Christianity. Certainly the direct love of Christ, as it was felt by His first followers, is a rare thing among modern Christians. That is wanting for the most part, which Christ held to be all in all, spontaneous warmth, free and generous devotion. That the fruits of a Christianity so hollow should be poor and sickly is not surprising.¹

All the same, the proportion of the real mixed with the unreal is not to be despised. There is to-day

¹ *Ecce Homo*, cheap edition, p. 49.

no warrant whatever for religious pessimism. Christianity may be more 'diffused,' and theology may be, in many valid respects, new. But both nationally and throughout the world the influence of the Christian faith is immeasurable, nor is there any factor in modern life to which more hopeful appeal may be made, when strongest desire is felt to substitute for the present European Inferno a comity of nations living together in harmony and happiness. However disheartening it may be to find such possibilities of devilry still working in humanity, after nearly twenty 'Christian' centuries, there is no more reason for panic religiously than politically or nationally. Even now, whilst the wholesale carnage which is reckoned legitimate in war is so staggering, and brutal excesses together with damnable atrocities which are accounted illegitimate, are being shamelessly committed by the German Huns to an extent worse even than the record of the Middle Ages, there is yet another side. These abominable treacheries and brutalities are at least estimated from a higher standard than ever before; and are causing a corresponding intensity of world-wide indignation which calls loudly for retribution on all such offenders. Furthermore, as to those horrors of war which are pronounced inevitable, more care is taken of the wounded, and more chivalry shown to prisoners, at all events by the Allies, than ever before. Never in the history of Europe has there been such sincere desire and earnest effort, on the part of all the nations except Germany and Austria, to avoid war, as in the present case. Nor has there ever been so intense a longing that war may be the end of war,

and the present conflict issue in an unbreakable peace. The insanity of the costly ideal of an 'armed peace,' which has been forced upon Europe during the last forty years, has become so manifest that, with the exception of Germany, all the nations are being convinced that the only way to secure peace for the future is to put a definite end to all preparations for war, and make such establishments as Krupp's at Essen, absolutely impossible for evermore.

Alas, that day has not yet dawned. Very much has to be suffered, as well as said and done, before humanity can so be brought to its senses. We are now in the midst of the throes of transition; and for that very reason, whilst our statesmen and politicians are nobly striving to guide our national affairs, and the heroes of our army and navy are sacrificing themselves to defend our precious home life, as well as meet on the field of battle our mighty and unscrupulous foes, it is most of all incumbent upon those who profess and call themselves Christians to see that they understand and are faithful to the principles which they avow. We will, therefore, occupy the rest of these pages in the earnest consideration of three great questions. First, the relation of Christianity to war in general; secondly, its true attitude to the present fearful struggle; and finally, the part which should be played by Christian people and Christian churches during the crisis which is upon us.

I

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO WAR
IN GENERAL

Religious newspapers bear abundant testimony to the fact that there is no little dissension hereupon amongst those who hold Christian beliefs. Hence it becomes necessary to state clearly what is here taken to be the substance and standard of genuine Christian principles. They may be expressed in a sentence. Christianity is the practice of the mind of Jesus Christ, as that is set forth in the New Testament, when this latter is fairly interpreted by itself. To be true to this, all that is necessary for our present purpose—which is practical, not theological—is to grasp and apply the main truth which underlies and gives origin to all else in the Gospel as Jesus brought it to humanity. This is, beyond all controversy, the universal Fatherhood of God, with its inevitable corollary the universal Brotherhood of man. When it is said that these are 'beyond controversy,' the fact is not overlooked that certain sections of the Christian Church still deny them, under the influence of a belated theology. But this attitude has been so sufficiently dealt with elsewhere, as to make it quite permissible

here to pass by, as untrue and unworthy, all exegeses and expositions which contradict the utterly unmistakable Apostolic summary—'*There is one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.*' By that inspired formula Christianity stands or falls. Here we assume that it stands.

(1) The first great Christian assertion, therefore, from which all else follows, is the absolutely unlimited Fatherhood of God. This gives the lie direct no less to Materialism, Naturalism, Agnosticism, Secularism, and Rationalism—as the popular anti-Christian cults style themselves—than to those theological misrepresentations which are traceable back through Calvin to Augustine, and in their ill influence are responsible for unmeasured revoltings from Christianity altogether.

When the popular journal known as *John Bull* writes as under, Christianity unhesitatingly sets it aside.

We speak of God in no personal sense—in no sense, in fact, capable of comprehension by the finite human mind. Something far too great and wonderful for that. We can no more give it shape or form or being, than we can conceive the infinity of space or the eternity of time. Priests may dogmatize; poets may dream; scientists may grope; philosophers may argue; but we stand to-day in relation to such things just where we stood far away in the ages—where perhaps we shall ever stand—bound Prometheus-like to the rock of mystery by the chains of our finite vision.

This seems fine reading in pages addressed to the people; but it utterly misrepresents the attitude of Christian Theism, and it wholly ignores Christ. It is no part of our duty here to reply to it, but

simply to point out that Christianity does not stand or fall by priests, poets, scientists, or philosophers, but by the teaching of Jesus Christ ; and to show Him to have been either deceiver or deceived, is a task beyond the powers of all the world's journalism combined.

The Christian thought of God is moreover as far removed from the swashbuckling pietisms of the Kaiser, as from modern Agnosticism. He speaks, indeed, quite unctuously about reading the Bible, and ostentatiously claims to have God's assistance in all his army's doings. In face of facts, however, to associate ' The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ ' with the work of his hordes, is nothing short of blasphemy. One does not know whether to read his utterances with scornful laughter for their bombast, or with indignation at their monstrous assumptions, as when he declaims :—

Remember that the German people are the chosen of God. On me, as German Emperor, the Spirit of God has descended. I am His weapon, His sword, and His viceroy. Woe to the disobedient ! Death to cowards and unbelievers !

It is no doubt a mystery to his royal mind why all ' unbelievers ' do not at once oblige him by dying. But such utterances are those of a lunatic. If sanity be insisted on for other words of his, such as these—

With God's assistance Duke Albrecht and his splendid army gained a glorious victory. You will join me in thanking the Almighty.

I rejoice with you in Wilhelm's first victory. How magnificently God supported him !

many and grave reasons—in spite of all the abetting German Theological Professors—prevent our ranking these pious expressions as Christian. We shall find overwhelming warrant presently for making here these three assertions, (i.) The present direful conflict, with all its horrors, is the direct, pre-meditated result of the attitude of the Kaiser and his environment. (ii.) It was not on their part a war of self-defence, but the carrying out of a long-intended scheme of aggression. As Bernhardi puts it :—

Our next war will be fought for the highest interests of our country and of mankind. World power or downfall will be our rallying cry. Keeping this idea before us, we must prepare for war with the confident intention of conquering.

(iii.) The conduct of the war on the part of the Germans, with the Kaiser's full knowledge and consent, has been accompanied with such unjustifiable barbarities and damnable atrocities as to call forth the execration of the whole civilized world. To associate all that we know concerning Louvain, Malines, Rheims, Senlis, Termonde, Aerschot, and many other places—apart from innumerable horrors of which we never shall know—with the God of whom the New Testament speaks, is an outrage upon the Christian faith. Pastor Stotte reports that in conversation with him the Kaiser said :—

Whenever I have to make any decision, I ask myself what the Bible would teach me to do in that particular case.

Does the Bible, then, teach him and his war-lords the devilish cruelties inflicted upon innocent men,

women, and children, which have undeniably been perpetrated with his consent? If it does, then his Bible must consist only of some special chapters in Numbers, Joshua, and Judges, which some of us used to hear Mr. Charles Bradlaugh challenge his audience to come on to the platform and read as Christian doctrine. The pity is that there is yet room and need to say—it can never be said too plainly—that it is not Christian doctrine at all. The Christian God is not the God of the frightful horrors of the conquest of Canaan by the Jewish invaders; any more than He is the Helper of the German Huns in doing their hellish deeds. The Christian God is not the tribal Deity of any one nation, but the God of love and mercy—‘the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort’—who so found exhibition in Jesus that He could say for all time, ‘He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.’

(2) In some churches—now happily more than ever before—this is asserted without hesitation. But there is no small danger of its becoming an orthodox platitude. When taken thoughtfully, it is an assertion so tremendous, alike in itself and its consequences, that the modern Agnostic who deems it too good to be true¹ may well be forgiven, and indeed regarded as nearer the truth than hosts of conventional worshippers who utter their ‘vain repetitions’ without costing themselves anything either as to the meaning or consequences of what

¹ ‘The Christian conception of God credits the supreme Being with supernal tenderness and mercy—“God is love.” That is a very lofty, poetical, and gratifying conception, but it is open to one fatal objection—it is not true’ (*God and My Neighbour*, R. Blatchford, p. 73).

they say. For if the Fatherhood of God be true, the Brotherhood of man cannot but follow. We will leave to their 'proof-texts' those Christians who deny this. The time has fully come to say, without any hesitation or equivocation, that by these doctrines—not by any theories of inspiration as to the Bible, or insisting upon rigid interpretations of theological standards¹—Christianity stands or falls for the modern world. Nor can anything less than the following be affirmed at the present moment on behalf of a valid Christianity.

(i.) Thanks partly to a false theology, together with a mistaken pietism, and the innate selfishness of human nature expressing itself through modern 'industrialism,' this great ideal has been sadly underrated in teaching, and overlooked in practice. The whole hope of the future, religiously as well as nationally, consists in appreciating and applying it.

(ii.) For even in times of peace between the nations, present-day civilization is a mocking satire upon brotherhood, and Christian churches are only slowly awaking to the implications of the Second great command. As the able author of the Bampton Lecture for 1907 has only too truly said, commenting upon Eccles. iv. 1 :—

'So I returned and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun, and behold the tears of such as were

¹ How far, alas, such insisting may go, is witnessed in the recent publishing by a band of obscurantists of the deliberate assertion that the present horrible war is the direct judgement of God upon the refusal of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference at Plymouth, to condemn on such grounds the Fernley Lecture of the Rev. George Jackson! Upon such folly—if not blasphemy—Rom. x. 2 seems too mild a comment.

oppressed, and they had no comforter ; and on the side of their oppressors there was power, but they had no comforter.'

They have no comforter. The present condition of affairs is horrible for the poor, and, rightly viewed, it is equally intolerable for the rich. Even the selfish, who frankly care for no interest but their own, are tormented by a sense of uneasiness and insecurity.

We have tried competition to the full, and it has made life into an unending struggle ; nothing so respectable as a real war with its clear issues and definite results, but rather like the aimless murderous bickerings of savage tribes, which give to the strong hand for a moment more than its share, at the cost of infinite material waste, suffering, and moral degradation.¹

(iii.) It is notoriously scorned and trampled on in the philosophy which has been disseminated through the whole German nation during recent years. To mention two names only, the influence of Nietzsche and Treitschke is as real and immeasurable as when poison germs are introduced into the human body. For the twenty years following his appointment at Basle, as professor of classical philology, in 1868, the former poured out his weird productions, which bore not only a mark of genius—the genius which in the end brought him to madness—but were equally distinguished for their hatred of Christianity and of England.

The Christian religion with its slave morality is, above all other, life's fiercest enemy.

Christianity is the greatest of all conceivable corruptions, the one immortal blemish of mankind. It is the one great curse, the one enormous and innermost perversion, the one great instinct of revenge.

¹ *The Reproach of the Gospel*, by J. H. F. Peile, pp. 95-112.

As for this country—

The English are the nation of consummate cant. In England every man who indulges in any trifling emancipation from theology, must retrieve his honour in the most terrifying manner by becoming a moral fanatic. The English are a fundamentally mediocre species, ponderous, conscience-stricken herding animals. The plebeianism of modern ideas is England's work and invention.

Whilst as to Treitschke, the reader of Bernhardi's volume on *Germany and the Next War*—which for the last three years has circulated throughout that country, and is now accessible in cheap form to every Englishman—will know what to think. Especially if also he studies the late Professor Cramb's *Germany and England*, he will see that Mr. William Archer truly summed up the situation in saying :—

Finally let us recognize beyond all possibility of doubt, that Treitschke was the apostle not only of militant Teutonism, but of war for its own sake. 'God will see to it,' he said, 'that war always recurs as a drastic medicine for the human race,' and if God be indeed the tribal Deity of the Hohenzollerns, this prophecy will doubtless be fulfilled.

In view of the contempt for other nations which has been thus instilled into the mind and heart of the German people during recent years, of course the notion of human brotherhood becomes what Nietzsche would have it, nothing but a contemptible, pious delusion, calling for scornful rejection.

(iv.) Assuredly in the cultivation of the brutal militarism which has developed in Germany during recent years above all other nations, there can be

no thought of universal brotherhood. Even the relations between officers and men in their own army are sufficient illustration. To talk of brotherhood in the actual bloody fights which war involves, is, of course, sheer mockery. Yet even that dire reality, which is horrible enough in very deed, is left behind in the shameless abominations which have been proved true on the German side—God be thanked, not on that of the Allies—which have not been merely inhuman but devilish. It were sheer desecration even to mention Christianity in any connexion with these.

(3) In the light of Christ's doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of man, these following principles must be clearly understood.

(i.) As a cruel relationship causing suffering between those who should be each other's helpers and comforters, all war is absolutely and for ever unchristian. Apart from all the glamour of 'glory' and the cruel irony of 'brilliant' victories, war is the most brutal and damnable device of man. What it really means only they know who have been directly associated with battle-fields, and have actually seen the myriads of ghastly corpses and poor torn smashed human bodies. A more infernal contradiction of all that is beautiful and natural and good and tender and helpful could not possibly be conceived. From the Christian standpoint, the battle-field is worse than hell.

Yet even war, like all other acknowledged evils, comes under Christ's solemn sentence—'Woe unto the world because of hindrances! for it is inevitable that hindrances should come; but woe to that

man through whom they come.’¹ For the whole wrong of any war, and for all the misery flowing from it, the man or party causing the war must be held entirely responsible.

(ii.) The cultivation of the war-spirit, i.e. the militarism, Jingoism, sheer assertion of might as against right, is utterly unchristian. It is entirely opposed to the spirit of Christ, and, so far as Christianity has power, must be ruled out of thought to the very utmost.

(iii.) Militarism and the war-spirit, when developed, lead necessarily to the piling up of armaments. This, as above hinted, is an insane principle for the preservation of peace between the nations ; as insane as seeking to preserve our houses from fire by strewing them with gunpowder and matches. It is equally unchristian. If, on the smaller scale, we were called upon in our homes to spread every meal-table with revolvers, as protection against our next-door neighbour, it would be pronounced utter folly. From the Christian standpoint, whether on the large or small scale, an ‘armed peace’ is worse than folly. It is the measure of human depravity ; as contrary to the mind of Jesus Christ as that of His murderers.

(iv.) When, however, we are assured that in modern national life it is sometimes absolutely necessary to make warlike preparations—as when a neighbouring nation assumes an unmistakably threatening attitude—the true answer is threefold. (1) It may be lamentably true that such preparation is necessary. At the present juncture, for instance, if the powerful navy of Britain had not been ready,

¹ Matt. xviii. 7 ; Luke xvii. 1.

there is no manner of doubt that by this time our country would be in the grip of starvation, if not also under the heel of the brutal military German tyranny. If Christianity really made that inevitable, it would call for the detestation rather than the acceptance of every free man. Hereupon Mr. Coulson Kernahan has spoken as truly as bravely.

If anything of worth is in any word of mine, it must be looked for in my religious writings. It is as one who has written—at least in all absolute earnestness, if with no other merit—as a humble, whole-hearted, unwavering believer in Christianity that I have any claim to be known at all.

Yet with not one whit of abated belief in Christianity, I am compelled to range myself with those who hold that to maintain the defence of our homes inviolate, and to be prepared to take one's part—if necessary to sacrifice one's life in the country's defence—is a Christian as well as a civil duty. That is why, in my fiftieth year, I joined the Territorial Army.

(4) Such an utterance, together with what it implies of opposition, may well bring us directly to the plain question which has to be faced, viz. whether the acceptance of Christianity compels us to adopt the principle of peace at any price. To such a query we reply most emphatically—No, it does not. There is, however, in our midst a minority of folk, mostly religious, who are called 'pacifists'—or 'pacifists'—who do not hesitate to teach, as publicly as possible, that all war, without any exception or any regard whatever to circumstances, is inexcusably wrong from the Christian standpoint. For them the Christian faith not only insists upon our doing no wrong, but also upon our offering no resistance to the wrong done by others.

Thus an eminent Professor in the Free Churches writes that his attitude

is that of a thorough-going Peace man, who thinks war a worse evil than any other, and practically no price too great to pay for peace.

Such an attitude, by whomsoever maintained, can never be Christian ; for it is most certain, on the principles of the New Testament, that war is *not* the worst evil that afflicts humanity. And, as we shall see in a moment, peace may be bought at too high a price, if we are moral beings, let alone Christians.

Speaking generally, and with all respect for personal convictions, the utterances of the Pacifists are distinguished not only by the emphasis with which they are put forth, but by other features which cannot be mistaken. The letters on this theme with which Editors are nearly overwhelmed, are largely characterized by (i.) assumptions that all who differ from them thereby show necessarily a lesser degree of spirituality and of loyalty to Christ ; (ii.) wholesale and misleading inferences from a few picked passages of the New Testament ; (iii.) willingness to see only a one-sided interpretation of those passages ; (iv.) disposition to say sharp and plausible things, in smart epigram, which will not bear the scrutiny of calm fairness ; and (v.) evasion of the plain facts of the case, whether as to their actuality, or cause, or consequence. Inasmuch as it would be unsatisfactory to enumerate these fallacies without proof, we will take presently one or two typical specimens into careful account. For the moment it is of greatest import to emphasize first, a plain

negative, viz. that neither Christ nor His apostles ever laid down the principle of peace at any price ; and then to point out positively what Christian ideals demand, as the accompaniments of any peace deserving the name, whether between men or nations.

The whole case might indeed be fairly dismissed under one of Paul's pregnant aphorisms—'*If it be possible*, as much as in you lies, be at peace with all men.' It is not always possible for us to-day, any more than it was for the writer of those words, or for his Master. Surely 'it is enough for the servant that he be as his Master.' Whether Christ's violent and forceful driving out of the rogues who infested the Temple involves, as one Pacifist somewhat foolishly suggests, that He is, by those Christians who approve of the present war, 'placed at the head of the battalions with a rifle on His shoulder,' is not the point. The real question is whether, according to His teaching and example, force is ever to be used in dealing with evil. The kind and degree of the force employed may be left to the particular occasion. If the much-quoted word in Matt. v. 39 be taken in crass Tolstoyan literalness, it is manifest that Christ Himself set it aside. For He did resist evil,¹ and that by the employment of physical force, as the narrative unmistakably shows.

Three other New Testament words are, however, generally appealed to, by those who urge the thorough-going plea for 'non-resistance,' as showing the only true Christian practice.

¹ Or, if Dr. Weymouth's rendering be preferred : 'I tell you not to resist a wicked man.'—He did forcefully resist wicked men.

It is pointed out that in Matt. xxvi. 52, Jesus said :—

Put up again thy sword into its place, for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

But two remarks here are certainly called for. If Matthew's account is of value, so is Luke's—in which it happens that no such warning occurs.

And He said to them, When I sent you forth without purse and wallet and shoes, did you lack anything? And they said, No, nothing. Then He said to them, But now, he who has a purse let him take it, and likewise a wallet : and he who has no sword, let him sell his coat and buy one.

Some significance, at least, there must be in this injunction ; and the emphasis which manifestly falls upon the ' now,' cannot but serve to show that differing circumstances, in Christ's judgement, called for different behaviour. Furthermore, when the misleading term ' shall ' is removed from the Revised Version's rendering of the passage in Matthew, and the ordinary unemphatic ' will ' rightly put into its place, it is seen at once that there is nothing left of the wholesale prohibition of all weapons which some have endeavoured to find in this saying. Christ's healing of the wounded ear is like His general procedure, but leaves without any contradiction the possibility that there may be a righteous employment of force in resisting evil. There is here no word of personal condemnation for the striker.

Another passage not seldom referred to is the account of the angels' song in Luke ii. 14. Some years ago Professor Tyndall wrote to the paper to

say that he could not accept Christianity because it had never fulfilled its promise as sung by the angels :—

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.

Perhaps the eminent physicist can hardly be expected to have been a textual critic; yet as an educated man he might have found, if he had examined the case as carefully as he would have done some statement in science, that there was a truer rendering of that word. Or, even failing that, he might have called to mind the prophet's solemn declaration :—

The wicked are like the troubled sea that cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.¹

The modern reader has no excuse whatever for drawing from the words in question any inference of universal and indiscriminate peace. What the plain man now reads, as he ought to do, in the Revised Version, is :—

Glory to God in the highest,
And on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased.²

That, assuredly, is neither promise nor approval of peace at any price.

But the phrase which more than any other is

¹ Isa. lvii. 20, 21.

² Luke ii. 14. Dr. Weymouth is still better—'And on earth peace, among men who please Him.'

quoted—and generally with an air of triumph, as if demonstrating at once and for ever that all who do not take it after Tolstoy's fashion, or in the prosaic exactness assumed, must be wanting either in intelligence or in honesty—is, of course, that which occurs in the 'Sermon on the Mount.'¹ This appears, when cut out of its proper setting in the whole paragraph, as 'But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil.' Multitudes of comments hereupon have been simply pitiful in the crass literalness with which the words have been interpreted, no less than the sweeping comprehensiveness with which they have been applied. Yet even the rendering of the phrase into our language is not so sure as to warrant such dogmatism. Thus we have, from equally competent sources, these alternatives:—

Resist not him that is evil (*Revised Version*).

But I tell you not to resist a wicked man (*Weymouth*).

But I tell you you are not to resist an injury (*Moffatt*).

I however say to you that you must not resist wrong (*Twentieth-Century New Testament*).

But I say unto you, That ye resist not the evil man (*John Wesley*.)

But I say unto you, Resist not the malicious (*International Critical Commentary*).

To deduce from any of these the all-comprehending principle that under no circumstances whatever is any resistance of any sort to be offered to evil, or to an evil-doer, is but lamentable and mischievous childishness. To base upon it—as, marvellous to relate, is now actually being done—a wholesale

¹ Matt. v. 39.

indictment of unchristian disloyalty to Christ, against every one who feels that the present European conflict is, on the side of the Allies, a Christian war, is not merely to poise a pyramid of condemnation upon an apex of warrant, but to set the apex itself upon a pious delusion.

To appreciate the pitifulness of such delusion one has only to apply it, after the same fashion, to the rest of Christ's words here. Take but the two preceding paragraphs. Verse 29 commands that—'If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out and cast it from thee.' Are there any instances of this being literally done by those Pacifists who insist that wicked men should always be allowed to do as they please, without resistance? Or again in v. 37, 'But let your speech be, Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay: and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one.' Do the literalists, then, go about among all their friends day by day saying nothing but 'Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay'? Their letters to newspapers, at all events, contain a great deal more. Or, if we do what ought always to be done with 'proof-texts'—put it back into its context—are the other injunctions of this very paragraph so literally taken? Do the Pacifists act upon v. 40—'If any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also'? Or do they daily practise, with all the indiscriminateness a literal acceptance involves, the command—'Give to him that asks thee, and from him that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away.' If they do, some of us would like their addresses.

If, however, we turn from these whims of piety

to the wisdom of the serpent which Jesus bade us cultivate, i.e. if we bring common sense as well as scholarship to bear upon His teachings, there are but two observations to be made here in the interests of truth. First, these four verses—which are rightly spaced off as a small paragraph—are intended, in the language and style of an Eastern teacher, well understood by those whom he addressed, to set forth a general principle; and without going now into minute discussion of Greek lexicography, the word employed in v. 39 is by no means a simple and exact synonym of our term ‘resist.’ The very first meaning given by Liddell and Scott is ‘to set over against or opposite, hence *to match with*, Lat. *componere*.’ It is well illustrated in Acts vi. 10, where it is recorded that those who did actually resist Stephen with all their might ‘were not able to *withstand* the wisdom and the Spirit by which he spake.’ That is, they could adduce nothing like it. It is, therefore, simple fidelity to the truth which bids us understand that what Jesus really sought to enunciate here, as a principle in His kingdom, was precisely what the Apostle also taught when he wrote to the Romans, ‘Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.’ And this leaves abundant room—in the honest but broad interpretation of ‘good’—for all those other considerations which must come into account, if we are to deal with wicked men and things on sane and practicable lines.

The attitude, however, of the Pacifists is so often vigorously expressed, with all the five characteristics above named, that it seems really necessary to reply to a few of their utterances which may be taken as

typical of the rest. If this be called 'controversial,' it cannot be helped. It is no more so than three-quarters of the New Testament ; and it is the method of both the Apostles and their Master.

We find, then, a writer in the *Christian World* putting it in this fashion :—

I have met the gibe about the front door unlocked too often to be disconcerted by it ; it is merely one of those hasty and obvious retorts which rest upon an elementary confusion of thought between police force and military force.

But whether the writer is disconcerted or not when the truth meets his error, there is no 'gibe,' and there is no 'confusion of thought' in what is suggested, when it is asked whether he and those who sympathize with him, acting directly on the literal acceptance of Matt. v. 39, refuse to have locks upon their doors or safes, in order that any thief who comes to them may not be resisted. It is fairly certain that this writer and his friends do *not* act upon this principle. Or if he does, he needs, as Tolstoy did, a capable wife to save him from himself. The real confusion, with all respect, is in the mind which does not, or will not, see that the principle is precisely the same behind both the 'police force' and 'military force.' In one word, it is *force*. And it is exercised in order to resist the evil man. The kind and degree of the resistance, or of the force required to overcome it, are quite irrelevant. Every one knows that the duties of the police could never be carried out, if it were not understood that there is force behind them. And if, in a burglar's armed resistance, he should get maimed or killed, the law will no more hold the

policeman guilty of violence or murder, than it will the soldier on the battle-field. The late Dr. Martineau was assuredly no militarist or Jingoist, for which reason some wise words of his may well be noted here :—

Every one who puts his money in an iron safe or a chain upon his house door relinquishes his reliance on the appeal of reason and conscience, and accepts the aid of material power. And if he has ever restrained the arm or chastised the disobedience of a passionate child ; if he has availed himself of the services of the police to arrest and of the courts to try the offender against his person or his goods ; if, in short, he consents to have a place in civil society at all, he has engaged himself by active coercion in resistance to evil, and in his private capacity *gone to war* with the delinquencies he meets.

Meanwhile we are neighbours each with his own trust, his own conscience, his own force ; bound to keep what is committed to us and not to stand by while wanton wrong is done. For these ends we have no guiding law but the sympathies of justice which bring states into generous alliance, and no administrative power but those armed battalions which are the only police of nations. A people without an army is chargeable with more than folly. It refuses its fair contribution to the police of the world ; and if while the power is there it selfishly looks on though murder it might prevent is passing before its eyes, its standards blazon forth a lie, and become the symbol not of order but of anarchy.¹

Again, we are asked, ‘ Does Mr. ——— really believe that the expulsion of the money-changers justifies all the devilry of war ? ’ This is one of the usual

¹ *Right of War*, pp. 3-6 (Longmans, twopence). See also Prof. Gilbert Murray’s *How can War ever be Right ?* p. 1 (Oxford University Press, twopence).

instances, as above affirmed, of the confusion and evasion which accompany this kind of plea. No one has ever said that the vigour of Christ's onslaught in the temple justified 'all (!) the devilry of war.' But they have truly said, what this writer simply refuses to acknowledge, that Christ's action was an unmistakable departure from that literal rendering of Matt. v. 39 which he and others seek to fetter upon the Christian conscience.

Again :—

My main thesis was that the Christian Church suffers deserved reproach to-day by reason of her attitude to the war.

But who has settled it that the Christian Church does really suffer reproach to-day for supporting our responsible statesmen, let alone deserve such reproach? This writer and his friends! That is all. An insignificant minority, so far as numbers are concerned. And whilst we would neither despise them for that, nor impeach their sincerity, they really must be asked to learn sufficient modesty to save them from thinking that what they say is true—simply because they say it. This, their statement, it is enough to reply, is not true.

The following is then printed as a fair sketch of the Church's attitude :—

Our preachers become recruiting-sergeants; the pulpits of the land reverberate with passion-producing heroics about German brutality; Nietzsche and Treitschke are reviled as baleful philosophic stars, whose only orbit is Prussia; the pew applauds politics in the pulpit when it speaks of Belgian neutrality, but it silences the preacher who declares the incompatibility of the balance of power

with Christ's vision of human Brotherhood. I utter no syllable of apology for Germany ; but neither will I call a Christian blessing upon the sins of my own land.

This is only too true a specimen of much more. And every assertion it makes is false. Neither preachers in pulpits, nor hearers in pews, are as narrow and shallow as this libel asserts, because they believe that Great Britain has been driven into a righteous war, entirely in accordance with New Testament principles. But the finishing stroke of this indictment is supposed to be here :—

This can never be the last war, while the Church is ready to justify an appeal to arms. She asserts that her trust is in God, and then, when emergency arises, she relies on the sword. That is her crowning reproach.

The assumption of infallibility in this pronouncement of sentence is as unwarranted as is the principle asserted. It might well suit the misguided folk who call themselves 'Christian Scientists'—whose proper name is 'Eddyists'—but certainly not those whose Christianity rests on a New Testament basis. Mrs. Eddy said—'God is good, therefore put your trust in Him, and when an emergency arises do nothing else. If you are ill, say that you are not ill ; but never employ, let alone rely upon, either doctor or medicine.' So, as Dr. Stephen Paget has truly averred, the path of that cult is strewn with wrecks of sufferings and deaths. But what would the world be, whether in daily life or in world-wide intercourse, if the principle which here is claimed—alike by her and by this writer—to be so specially Christian, were universally acted on ? Because God is good, we are to trust

in Him; but when any emergency arises, we are to do nothing to save or help ourselves. One wonders what this writer and his friends would have said to the Apostle Paul when, as we are told in Acts xxvii. 31, he declared to the centurion and soldiers as he saw the sailors about to forsake the doomed ship—'Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved.' Had he not just previously told them that God had sent him an unmistakable message that there should be 'no loss of life' among them all? So then, when the emergency arose, he relied upon the sailors. But we are not told that that was his 'crowning reproach.' No. The real 'reproach' falls upon any man professing to be a Christian teacher, and then insisting upon false principles which would wreck not only Christianity but all civilization. If trust in God meant that we were to do nothing for ourselves, but let evil, in any and every form, whether murder, or robbery, or lust, or greed, or disease, or starvation, have their unresisted way whilst we trusted, such a belief would only turn the world into a huge asylum. Every sane man would of necessity become an Agnostic. It may be quite true that 'without the Cross the Church has no message for the life of the nation.' But it is entirely false that 'the Cross' consists in misinterpreting the doctrine of Jesus, and seeking to put upon the necks of modern Christians a yoke which neither our fathers nor we are able to bear.

From another journal we will take, for the truth's sake, another appeal. The Wesleyan Committee of Privileges has 'thankfully recognized' that 'our young manhood is responding, with hosts of Mohammedans and Hindus, to the touch of the imperial

war drum that summons men to the fight of Christ against the Devil.' Upon this we are told :—

One may be pardoned for asking, Where, then, is Jesus the Crucified ?—' This is My commandment, that ye love one another.'

The answer to such a question is that 'the Crucified' is where He put Himself, and not where superficial pietism would place Him, viz. at the head of those who do so 'love one another' as to be willing to forgo ease and comfort, face cruel hardship, and run deadly risks, in order to protect and save others who are innocent victims of tyranny and evil. The men of whom this writer appears to be ashamed, have done much more to emulate the example of the Crucified who said, 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends,' than any writer of letters to a newspaper criticizing them. 'The Crucified' said of Himself :—

The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me,
Because He has anointed Me to proclaim good news to
the poor :

He has sent Me to announce release to the prisoners of
war ;

And recovery of sight to the blind ;
To send away free those whom tyranny has crushed,
To proclaim the year of acceptance with the Lord.¹

—and all this is much more really embodied in those who give themselves and all they hold dear to defend the right and save the weak, than by any others who, whilst they find fault, live in peace

¹ Luke iv. 18, 19 (Weymouth).

only through the very self-sacrifice they condemn. We are, however, further told that—

It is well to be original, but men of conservative mould may perhaps be shocked when Jesus is taken from the cross at the entrance to the narrow way that leads to life, and placed at the head of the battalions with a rifle on His shoulder, in the way that is very broad and that leadeth to destruction.

If this exemplifies the 'conservative mould' it is pitiful enough. The whole excerpt so fully exemplifies number four of the characteristics mentioned above, that it would not be worth quoting were it not for the attraction which this style of thing has for well-meaning people who are not given to thought. As a summary of the attitude of those Christians who are supporting the action of the Government during the present crisis, it is reprehensibly as well as pitifully false. When, indeed, one considers who not a few of these Christians are, even though we mention here no names, such a representation is really an insult and a libel. Jesus is *not* by them 'taken from the cross' any more than He is 'placed at the head of battalions.' Whilst to say, without any discrimination, that the way of every soldier on the field is 'very broad and leadeth to destruction,' is a wholesale slander as well as a false implication. There have been, thank God, not a few soldiers whose piety was every whit as real as that of their professional critic. But let us face the rest:—

The resolutions imply that this is a righteous war. But how is the word righteous defined? By the content given to it in the New Testament, or according to the standard of

thought in the year 1000 B.C., before Isaiah and Micah had their visions of the time when men should learn the art of war no more?

Such a carping query is answered as soon as asked. The writer will find it in one single comprehensive utterance of the Apostle :—

Finally, brothers, keep in mind whatever is true, whatever is worthy, whatever is just, whatever is pure, whatever is attractive, whatever is high-toned, all excellence, all merit.¹

That will suffice as a definition of 'righteous,' for those who affirm that this is, on Britain's part, 'a righteous war.' Nor is there anything, in either Isaiah or Micah, to controvert it; any more than there is in the teachings of Jesus. How actually all these elements enter into the present case will appear shortly when we come to consider the facts.

But again :—

The resolutions declare that England is in danger. Then either the arm of our God is shortened that He cannot save, or we have substituted an idol in His place. The Dreadnought a workman maketh it, and the ironsmith spreadeth it over with iron and casteth for it mighty guns. He that is too impoverished for such an oblation, chooseth a bayonet that will stab deep. We teach our children to revere a God who built the mountains, and we trust in guns to save us from an enemy who cannot form one blade of grass.

More than any religion upon earth Christianity has reason to cry, 'Save me from my friends!' For this style of writing is exactly that which can be found

¹ Phil. iv. 8. (Moffatt).

any week, in the clever journals of Secularism and Agnosticism. If the writer of it does not see it is pitiful—if he does, it is worse—that all this applies to every meal he takes when in health, and every remedy he tries when ill. Keep even a Christian family long enough without food and they will starve—then either the arm of our God is shortened that it cannot save, or we have substituted an idol, viz. a baker's oven, in His place. As for the surgeon's knife, whereby alone a precious life may be prolonged, 'A workman maketh it, and the attendant spreadeth it over with bactericides, without which the patient is not saved from septic poisoning, even by the God who has made all germs as well as all blades of grass.' The ideal here suggested is that of a pious imbecile who, without any effort of his own, expects God to feed him when he is well, to cure him when he is ill, to preserve him from harm when he walks headlong into danger. In a word, to do exactly what Christ Himself refused to do, when, as we are told :—

The devil took Him to the Holy City, and caused Him to stand on the roof of the Temple, and said :

If You are God's Son, throw Yourself down ; for it is written, To His angels He will give orders concerning Thee, And on their hands they shall bear Thee up, Lest at any moment Thou shouldest strike Thy foot against a stone.

Again it is written, replied Jesus, Thou shalt not put the Lord thy God to the proof.¹

We are, however, further informed that—

The resolutions declare that Britain can appeal in this case to the God of peace to help her in what is likely to be

¹ Matt. iv. 5-7 (Weymouth).

the most terrible holocaust of blood in the records of the ages. So, then, our logic has come to this, that the God who said 'Love your enemies' is now likely to help us in shooting them.

It is confessedly difficult to reply calmly to such plausible but shallow pietisms as these. For they are nothing more. Before rational and honest scrutiny they disappear like pricked bubbles. This is, indeed, the way in which almost all the mischievous heresies and wretched superstitions in Christian history have been manufactured, and are to this hour being propagated. Some one picked sentence is cut out from all its context, fastened to a narrow and generally false significance, and made the sole basis of a whole scheme of living. Take one other example from Mrs. Eddy:—

Jesus once said, Take no thought for your life—take no thought for your body—God is able to feed and clothe man as He doth the lilies.¹

But apart from the false suggestion that there is no difference between a man and a flower, Jesus never did say this, whatever may appear in the older English Version. What He did say may be found in the Revised, and elsewhere. The principle is precisely the same as here. 'Take no thought.' 'Love your enemies.' So, then, nothing else calls for consideration, and the narrowest interpretation is the truest ! Alas for the Christianity of the future, unless somehow better counsels than these come to prevail.

To quote first the above writer's own query—'How is the word love defined?' Does it involve that

¹ *Science and Health*, pp. 170, 382, 530.

in all cases whatever, without any exception, enemies are to be allowed to do just as they will with us, and with all who depend on us? Certainly it does not; if it is to be defined 'by the content given to it in the New Testament.' No warrant, we know, is there found for selfish aggression or oppression. But so far as self-defence is concerned, even the second Great Command begins at the end. 'Thou shalt love thy fellow man as thou *lovest thyself*.' Self-love, then, to this extent is certainly holy, that a man is warranted in doing whatever is necessary in defending his own life against a murderer. The law which recognizes the possibility of justifiable homicide, is quite as Christian as the injunction to give alms to the needy. The method employed, whether shooting in these days, or sword and spear as in ancient times, is irrelevant. There is nothing whatever incompatible in a Christian man's loving his enemy, and yet being compelled to do him injury in the prevention of his wicked designs. This, again, is quite included in the Apostle's word above quoted—'If it be possible, as much as in you lies, be at peace with all men.'

Nor is that all. Amongst many other injunctions we may not forget that the Christian is called upon to care for others, besides himself. Says Paul, plainly:—

Whoever does not provide for his own relatives, and particularly for his own family, has repudiated the faith; he is worse than an unbeliever.¹

What does provision mean, if not protection from a ruthless, cruel, barbarous enemy such as the German

¹ 1 Tim. v. 8.

hordes have proved themselves to be towards innocent men, women, and children, in poor Belgium? If the love of enemies meant that a husband and father should stand by, with maudlin tears, whilst his wife and children were being tortured and butchered, Christianity would deserve the scorn which Nietzsche loved to pour upon it. But the whole New Testament endorses the Apostle's verdict that such a one would deny the faith. All Pacifists agree in echoing Christ's words in regard to 'The good Samaritan.' To His 'Go and do thou likewise' they give most eager assent, as indeed all other Christians do. But we have good warrant for asking, Suppose that this same Samaritan had arrived there an hour or two sooner, and caught the robbers at their cruel work, are we to suppose that the Master's commendation assumed that he would stand by with helpless lamentation until they had finished their deed of blood, because it would be wrong for him to 'resist' the evil man? If he had done so, the 'good' Samaritan would never have been heard of.

We are informed in the press that—

Mr. Asquith moved his hearers to the inmost depth when he said, 'For my part I say that sooner than be a silent witness, which means in effect a willing accomplice, to this tragic triumph of force over law, and of brutality over freedom, I would see this country of ours blotted out of the pages of history.'

But he did more than move his hearers. He echoed the mind of Jesus Christ, quite as fully and faithfully as any revival preacher, and spoke only in perfect harmony with the whole ethical principle of the New Testament.

It requires much patience to bear with the assumptions of superior piety which characterize not a few Pacifist deliverances. Here is another :—

And we pray for a revival, a revival of scriptural holiness. May one ask if this is to be holiness like unto that of Samuel when he hewed Agag in pieces, or the holiness that Jesus manifested when He died for His enemies ?

Scriptural holiness speaks for itself when the Bible is fairly treated. But it is as grossly unfair treatment of the Bible as of our noble leaders in government to-day, to draw a parallel (!) between them and the circumstances and actions of Samuel. Moreover, as regards the holiness manifested in the death of Jesus for His enemies, He Himself said—‘ Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.’ And as the writer here, whether he owns it or not, is one of the ‘ friends ’—the English citizens—for whom our brave and self-sacrificing soldiers are even now laying down their lives, in order that he may have food and liberty, it ill becomes him to sneer at them as going in ‘ the way that is very broad and that leadeth to destruction.’ The New Testament conception of holiness certainly is not confined to the mechanical observance of a crass literalism which is content with reiterating ‘ Resist not evil.’ There is as real Christian holiness in the devotion to duty, and facing of death for others’ sakes, which characterize thousands of our noble soldiers, as in any convention ever held at Southport or at Keswick. When Nelson gave the watchword, which neither Army nor Navy will ever let go—‘ England expects every man to do his duty,’ it was as real and as integral a part of

Christian holiness as any emotional hymn ever sung, or 'spiritual' sermon ever preached. It is, alas, the lack of a true and firm and practical ethical basis for the prevalent conception of holiness, which gives such occasion for anti-Christian writers like Mr. Blatchford to declaim to their fellows against it.¹

When we are asked :—

Was it by war or by love that Methodism had its birth ?
We sow war and wait for the nations to bring forth peace,

the question is as irrelevant as the insinuation is false. There is no parallel between the circumstances of this country in John Wesley's time, and now. Though there have been, and yet are, hosts of Methodist soldiers who have been quite as good Christians as any Pacifist. Furthermore, it must be said plainly that the insinuation 'We sow war,' as applied to the present crisis, is wholly false. We, as a nation, have *not* sown war. We have striven to the utmost, and to the last, for peace. Here is illustrated, as only too often, what was said in number five above—the ignoring or evading of the undeniable facts of the case by those who claim so to teach superior principles. We shall have to return to this. But it is hard to read without indignation the equally sweeping and false accusation implied in other words from the same source :—

One thinks of that forgotten voice that cried—' When ye make many prayers I will not hear ; your hands are full of blood.'

¹ 'Holiness ! for shame ! The word is obnoxious. It has stood so long for craven fear, for egotistical inebriation, for selfish retirement from the trials and buffets and dirty work of the world. What have we to do with such dreamy, self-centred emotional holiness here and now in London ?' (*God and My Neighbour*, p. 192).

The exegesis is wholly false. For the context will show that there was no reference whatever to war on that occasion ; and the chapter from which it is taken distinctly affirms that it is applied only to a special time of national depravity 'in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.' Its employment here, therefore, to support a narrow-visioned criticism, is on a par with the use of other verses in the same chapter—'From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it,' as 'proof-text' of the 'total depravity' of human nature, with which, manifestly, it has nothing whatever to do. It is a cruel and unworthy libel on the part of any Christian minister, to suggest that in their attitude towards the overweening arrogance and brutal militarism of Germany, which alone have caused the present Armageddon, the hands of our statesmen and soldiers are 'full of blood.'

Finally :—

The kingdom of God is super-national. Its members cannot think in terms of Jew or Greek, Briton or German. War is the negation of all that that kingdom stands for.

The first sentence here no real Christian or Christian Church questions, let alone denies. The second is false, although it looks like truth, and is so easily said. The kingdom of God 'stands for' all that lies at the very root of the present war, so far as we are concerned in it. The kingdom of God stands certainly for truth, for love, for honour, for liberty, for faithfulness to duty, for compassion ; and all these, as we shall in a moment show, constitute, so far as this country is involved, the very

fons et origo of the present wretched war. But let us hear the last word of this only too typical special pleading:—

War is the denial of a God of love, and its denial is pledged not merely with oaths and curses, but with shells and flames of hell. He is indeed an optimist who can expect any revival until the words of Jesus are dug up from the grave where our Committee has laid them.

Even when all the horrors of war are sadly acknowledged, it is *not*, in this sweeping fashion, the ‘denial of a God of love.’ There have been thousands of Christian soldiers who have held to the love of God as truly as any preacher in the pulpit. It is only such a ‘denial’ on the part of those who are responsible for its outbreak. In the case before us, that certainly does not lie on this country. Hence, there is no more denial of the foundation of the Christian faith in the behaviour of our statesmen and soldiers, than there is in the action of ‘our Committee.’ No doubt in this free country—which it would not long be, if the Pacifists had their way—any man may express his own opinion. But it is at the least decidedly immodest for one man to assert, with such an air of dogmatic infallibility, that those who differ from him in judgement have been so lacking, either in intelligence or honesty, as wilfully to deny the main principles of the faith they met to uphold. Protest may be good. But too much protest may be as unworthy as unwarranted.

We have taken notice in detail of all these expressions of opinion, solely because they are representative of a minority whom we do not wish to ignore. But it is more to the purpose of these pages

to lay down general principles. It may, therefore, be well here to supply the positive side to the negative which was enunciated above. It is definitely affirmed that the notion of peace at any price, as if war was the worst thing on earth, is not a Christian principle. What, then, it may well be asked, is the price of peace? What are those elements in human life and character which cannot be forsaken, or let go, even to preserve peace, when war is threatened? Are there any factors in human society so priceless and essential, that even the horrors and devilry of war are to be preferred to the loss of them? There are. As hinted a moment ago, truth, love, honour, liberty, faithfulness to duty, compassion for sufferers, and deliverance for victims of oppression, these all are of infinitely more value to human beings, whatever be the price paid for them, than any duration of peace would be when they were absent. The significance of truth and love, in relation to present circumstances, we will shortly consider. Here we will go further than Mr. Asquith, and say that, without honour, not only would it be well for English history to cease, but life itself would not be for us, as men and Christians, worth living. 'Whatsoever things are honourable,' wrote the Apostle so emphatically to the Philippians, 'estimate them at their proper worth.'¹ How does that principle affect the case before us? Thus:—

(1) The scorning of international treaties, which have been definitely made and deliberately signed, as mere 'scraps of paper,' to be set at naught when convenient, under the pretext that necessity knows no

¹ Phil. iv. 8.

law, is not merely dishonourable to the last degree, but positively immoral, and immeasurably pernicious. It is but lying on the large scale. If that may be permitted, then morality and civilization are at an end for ever, and man has reverted to the beast. Such a prospect may find some support in the philosophy of Nietzsche, but none whatever in the gospel of Christ. It is Machiavellian, not Christian.

(2) The special import which attached to faithfulness as regards the sacredness of Belgian neutrality, is openly acknowledged by the German Chancellor, but defended on the ground of necessity. 'We know that we did wrong, but we had to'! Imagine that, as an avowed principle for a nation boasting alike of its 'culture' and its religion! Let the Apostle Paul be the judge:—

And why not—as we be slanderously reported, and some affirm that we say,
Let us do evil that good may come—whose condemnation is just.

Why do not the Theological Professors, of all people, who are so bitterly inveighing against England, either deny the statement of their own Chancellor, or undertake to defend it in the name of Christianity? They know that they cannot do either.

(3) The militarism which has, by all acknowledgement, found its breeding-ground in Germany during recent years, is not only destructive of freedom, but intolerable to any decent appreciation of human nature. The Christian estimate of humanity rejects it with scorn. Bernhardt's ideals, with all that they involve, in the reduction of men who are the children of God to mere fractions in a huge fighting machine,

are, from the Christian standpoint, simply abominable. Mark these words :—

Our people must learn to see that the maintenance of peace never can be, or may be, the goal of a policy.

The inevitableness, the idealism, and the blessing of war, as an indispensable and stimulating law of development, must be repeatedly emphasized. I must try to prove that war is not merely a necessary element in the life of nations, but an indispensable factor of culture, in which a true civilized nation finds the highest expression of strength and vitality.

With such a shameless apotheosis of brute force, Christianity can make no terms whatever.

(4) More than that. Christianity lays down a law, best stated in Apostolic language :—

We then that are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves.

Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.

Nietzsche's scorn for such ' slave morality ' is nothing to us who rejoice to ' make it our real love and high ambition whether we live or die to be accepted of Christ.'¹ His injunction, ' Go and do thou likewise,' thus includes, for every true disciple, not only the binding up of wounds that have been inflicted, but the prevention of their infliction so far as lies in our power. To stand by unmoved whilst a smaller nation, which had done no harm to any one, and only asked to be let alone, for peaceful development, was for that very reason pounced upon as a bully

¹ 2 Cor. v. 9. Pitifully misrendered in the Old Version, ' Wherefore we labour, that whether present or absent we may be accepted.' The Greek verb fuses love and honour into one holy passion.

would turn upon a little child that stood in his way, and subjected to ruthless barbarities far exceeding what civilization has declared to be honourable in war, would deservedly have stamped this country, which was pledged to help it, with eternal infamy. Selfish cowardice would have been justly branded for ever upon the escutcheon of Great Britain. When that is shown to be necessary part of Christian devotion, the knell of Christianity will be well rung.

(5) Again; when it is said that Christianity stands for love, it would seem at first sight as if both the satire of its enemies and the Pacifist fanaticism of some of its friends, were alike justified. But it is the Master Himself who bids us not judge 'according to the appearance, but righteous judgement.' It must be owned that when the ideal of human intercourse which is sketched out as the Christian life of love in 1 Cor. xiii., and the first of John's letters, is put side by side with the precepts of Nietzsche, Treitschke, and Bernhardi, and the practice of war, even at its best, it looks indeed as if Christ had failed.

The Saviour came; with trembling lips
He counted Europe's battleships:
Yet millions lack their daily bread;
'So much for Calvary,' He said.

But lofty ideals which seem to be absurdities, are by no means wholly lost. 'War is hell,' as General Sherman declared; and the German hordes in this war have, beyond all honest doubt, behaved even worse on many occasions than the Huns of old. Still there are humane men even among German officers, and certainly sometimes their Red Cross

work has been done as sympathetically as that of the Allies. But all such care for the wounded would have seemed absurd to the hosts of Attila. The acknowledged horrors of war are already being robbed, in the name of an avowedly Christian civilization, of as many of their direst features as possible. The absurdity indeed remains. But its poisoned sting is drawn. The battle-field is truly the culmination of absurdity no less than of suffering. There are two stages of it : when men meet to fight and when they have fought. The first absurdity is wicked, for the men have no quarrel whatever against each other. But not the second. The idiotic rules of war are, that as long as the opposing soldiers are unwounded, their duty is to do each other all the harm they can ; but the moment one of them is so wounded as to be disabled, he becomes no longer an enemy but a friend, for whom no care can be too tender, no medical attention too skilful. And all civilization has now so endorsed this 'absurdity' of mercy, as to denounce, with unmeasured execration, the brutal behaviour to the contrary which has undoubtedly characterized not a few German instances ; though, it may be fearlessly affirmed, none on the part of the Allies.

But Christianity stands for more love than that, even in face of war. The second great command says explicitly—and Jesus Himself declares that there is no greater command—'Thou shalt love thy fellow man, as thou lovest thyself.' But if human nature gratefully accepts this high permission to make the most and best of oneself, in the midst of life's problems, what are the lines on which such holy love of self can find expression ? What does

a man need most, prize most, in his desire and purpose to make life worth living? Is it not liberty, with some humble share of all those enjoyments which are associated with it? Where, then, can the true love of one's fellows be so truly manifested as in being and doing all that comes within our power, to secure for them, as really as for ourselves, those inestimable blessings? Would, one must ask, the man—or the nation—who himself possessed all these good things, and saw his brother man robbed of them and ground under the heel of a remorseless tyranny, without lifting a finger to help or to save him, be playing a Christian part? God forbid! If Christianity meant that, it would be no Gospel of love, but a mean and cowardly scheme of selfishness, deserving all the scorn of which a Nietzsche or a Carlyle—and certainly a Paul—would heap upon it.

From all the foregoing, therefore, the main deduction is unmistakable. War in general, as a human relationship and practice, is absolutely and for ever opposed to Christianity. It sets at nought the Fatherhood of God, and reviles the Brotherhood of man. If men were Christian indeed, war would be for ever impossible. But they are not; and no power in heaven or on earth can make them so. Hence the 'occasions of stumbling' to which Jesus referred as inevitable, arise, and it is not possible to be at peace with all men. Circumstances may and do arise, out of the perversity of human nature and the complexity of human relationships, in which it is alike impossible for a true man to avoid resisting evil, or a nation to abstain from war and be true to all that Christian principles involve.

II

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PRESENT WAR

Thus far we have dealt with general principles. It is necessary now to come to their faithful application. The ghastly state of things described in our daily papers has come upon us, in this country at all events, with all the suddenness of an earthquake. Even the minority who have for some years feared some such catastrophe, and have been scowled upon as scaremongers for their pains, did not dream that it would burst upon us with all this unexpected fury of a tornado, just at present. It becomes more and more certain each month, that such a cataclysm never could have come upon Europe so soon or so suddenly, if the main party to it had not long been ready and waiting for the opportunity to expend the forces it had accumulated for that very purpose. Such a suggestion, we know well enough, is indignantly denied by the German press—which appears to be capable of printing anything—and by those Professors of ‘culture’ and theology who have so committed themselves to marvellous but demonstrable mendacities. Here, with all frankness but without malice, it is our aim and duty to state plainly the case for this country and Empire, viewed

unhesitatingly from the Christian standpoint. It may be formulated under the following heads:—

(1) The real origin and cause of the war was the mind of Germany, as represented in the Kaiser and his environment.

(2) With a view to this outburst, vast and elaborate preparations have been going on in Germany—and by Germans in other countries treacherously—during recent years.

(3) In the conduct of the war there has been, openly, and with the definite consent of the Kaiser and his Staff, not only (i.) at the beginning, immoral disregard of truth and honour, but (ii.) in the following campaign, such abominable barbarities and damnable atrocities as to call forth the execration of the whole civilized world.

(4) That the Allies, both separately and together, have had this war forced upon them against their will.

(5) That this country, in particular, had unmistakable and overwhelming reasons for taking part in the conflict.

(6) That the attitude of Great Britain has been and still is misrepresented throughout the world by wholesale, multiplied, and reiterated German lies.

(7) That the part taken by this country, however costly and tragic, was inevitable, honourable, and unselfish, and therefore was and continues to be definitely Christian.

These items constitute, beyond all doubt, a very heavy indictment. Seeing then that Christianity stands for the truth, above all else—for its most solemn warnings and tenderest assurances are nothing worth unless they finally rest on truth—the

question which now must be fairly and fully met is, are these things true? That they are, shall now be shown without evasion or equivocation.

(1) *As to the Real Cause of the War.*

Amidst the swarms of assertions and denials which have been poured forth upon this crucial question, the following facts stand out prominently as being beyond honest controversy. They suffice to show that the real cause of this deplorable conflict was the attitude of Germany, as expressed by the Kaiser and his war-lords.

(i.) The Kaiser is unquestionably the centre, ever active and influential, of the German Government. Whether we are able, amongst conflicting opinions, to fasten upon him personally the burden of responsibility for the declaration of war, or not, it is certain that from him, and those who surround him, proceeded the correspondence with other Powers recorded in the most useful penny booklet—*Great Britain and the European Crisis*—issued by the Government of this country. A fair perusal of that document leaves but one conviction possible; viz. that but for Germany's attitude, all difficulties might have been arranged. There is no need here to quote by way of proof, from pages which are or may so easily be in the hands of every intelligent citizen. The introductory narrative of events is unimpeachable for accuracy. The correspondence laid before Parliament speaks for itself. The speeches made by Sir E. Grey and Mr. Asquith show, unequivocally, that as far as this country is concerned, everything that could honourably be

said to Germany, with a view to avoiding war, was put to its representatives.

The real reason, however, and explanation of the German poorly concealed determination to bring on a war, does not appear in this booklet, but must be sought, and may all too soon be found, elsewhere.

The actual though invisible, and most potent though unmentioned cause of the implacable attitude which resulted intentionally in the war, was the influence of a party in Germany which has been gathering strength for nearly a quarter of a century, and which practically dominates not only the Government of that country, but, *mirabile dictu*, the Kaiser himself. A brief but clear and important statement of this party, known as the 'Pan-German League,' is given in easy form by C. R. L. Fletcher, in his two little pamphlets published by the Oxford University Press.¹ Founded in 1891, it has now a membership of half a million of 'intellectuals.' Its ideals were set forth some three years ago, in a sumptuous volume of 850 pages, beautifully bound, with 5,000 illustrations, for the ridiculous price of four shillings. It has published also an *All-German Catechism*, and issues a weekly newspaper, *All-German Leaves*. It has also 'now got either the controlling influence over, or the opportunity of freely expressing its opinions in, nearly all the most widely read of the German newspapers.' Furthermore—'Every time the Government has entered upon anything approaching an open struggle against the

¹ Entitled *The Germans*. (1) 'Their Empire: How They Have Made It.' (2) 'What They Covet.' These should be read by every one in these realms. They cost only twopence each.

League, the League has won, and the Government has had to beat a hasty and often an undignified retreat.' For the last ten years, at least, it has never ceased to incite its 'All-Germans' against both France and England; and indeed to urge, after true Bernhardian fashion, the immediate desirability of war with those countries. When, in 1908, the Kaiser spoke to the representative of the *Daily Telegraph* about his regard for England, and his wish for continued peace, the League actually brought him to book in the German Parliament, and the Chancellor announced that he would be a better boy in future.

Thus it has come to pass that the more educated, and therefore influential, portion of the German nation, has been thoroughly saturated with three unmistakable ideals. (i.) That nothing less than universal dominion—'world-power'—is Germany's divinely appointed mission. (ii.) That the surest and indeed only way to accomplish that mission, is by means of war. (iii.) That of the three Great Powers which stood out as hindrances to Germany's attaining to her proper position, viz. Russia, France, and England, the last-named was the most to be dreaded, and therefore the most to be hated. This is the soil out of which the present war has sprung, and but for which it would no more have been possible, than that there should be an explosion when a lighted match is thrust into a heap of sand. All the wounded vanity of the Kaiser, and the fury of his fire-eating eldest son, together with the ever bitter animosity of the German court, would not have dared to let loose the hell-hounds of war, if they had not known that, thanks to the Pan-German

League, the nation had been brought to believe that such a step was not only an absolute necessity, but the will of God concerning the Fatherland.

(ii.) It is entirely demonstrable by information which has since come to light, that there had long been a definitely conceived intention and secretly pre-arranged plan, first to smash France by a repetition of the lightning stroke of 1870, then to cripple Russia, then, by the enormous development of army and navy, to overwhelm Great Britain. Only so was there any probability of bringing to pass the coveted position—*Deutschland über alles*.

(iii.) The next link in the chain of causes was the perception by the ruling powers of Germany that now would be a more favourable time than later to bring on the long-projected war, because the Russian railway system, which is absolutely necessary to enable that vast country at any time to mobilize, was not yet completed. Whilst as to France, it was fairly manifest that every year the military strength and general efficiency of the French army was being further developed. It was also thought—though this was but one of a whole series of vast and pitiful mistakes made by the Kaiser and his advisers—that England was on the verge of civil war through Irish affairs, and Labour on the brink of revolution in connexion with its troubles; whilst India was pining for rebellion, and Egypt could easily be inflamed on religious grounds; so that Britain would fall an easy prey to resolute attack by a foe so powerful as the perfected German army, along with the newly-prepared German navy. It is no secret that for some time German officers, in both army and navy, have been wont on festive

occasions to toast each other with 'The day,' which they all well understood to be the opportunity to crush England. Now, to those who thought they knew best and saw farthest, 'the day' had come.

(iv.) The Austro-Servian quarrel was only the occasion, certainly not the cause, of the strained situation which led with such tragic suddenness to the outbreak of hostilities. We find Sir M. de Bunsen, Ambassador at Vienna, writing to Sir E. Grey on July 27¹ :—

I have had conversations with all my colleagues representing the Great Powers. The impression left on my mind is that the Austro-Hungarian Note was so drawn up as to make war inevitable; that the Austro-Hungarian Government are fully resolved to have war with Servia.

But private information leaves no room to doubt that such an ultimatum, which could not but drive Servia into war, was only prepared in concert with Germany. Nor is it at all difficult to see why, from what we know elsewhere. Mr. Asquith pointed out with truth that the Servian nation, acting apparently on the recommendation of Russia, consented to as much as ever she could, in order to avoid a conflict. Sir E. Grey said—'It seems to me that the Servian reply already involved the greatest humiliation that I have ever seen a country undergo.' By accepting that reply, Germany and Austria could both have maintained peace with honour. What more also could Russia do, to prove the sincerity of her wish for peace, than state her readiness, if Servia appealed to the Powers, to stand aside, and leave

¹ See No. 41 in the correspondence in the booklet above referred to, *Great Britain and the European Crisis*.

the decision with England, France, Italy, and Germany? But to this Germany would not consent. Her plan was to put upon Servia such an intolerable humiliation that Russia, as the acknowledged Friend and Protector of the Slavs, could not but step in. That would afford the welcome excuse, to a nation all ready and prepared, for opposing Russia, and so bringing about a European struggle.

(v.) When all the correspondence laid before the British Parliament—and given in the Government booklet above mentioned—is carefully perused, it appears to be beyond all controversy that Sir E. Grey, in spite of the venomous hatred now accorded him in Germany, deserved the tribute paid him in the House by Mr. Asquith :—

If his efforts on this occasion have unhappily been less successful, I am certain that this House and the country, and I will add posterity and history, will accord to him what is after all the best tribute that can be paid to any statesman, that, never derogating for an instant or by an inch from the honour and interests of his own country, he has striven as few men have striven to maintain and preserve the greatest interest of all countries, universal peace. But this war has been forced upon us.

When it is asked, Then, who forced it? we reply, Germany did. What is the use of the storm of pious indignation raised by philosophical and theological Professors in that country—that such an accusation is false—when we have in our hands, and know that for the last three years Germany has been saturated therewith, the deliberate avowals of the man whose endorsement of Treitschke has been the veritable Bible of the army, and the most effective instructor of the great mass of the people in regard

to 'the next war'? Mr. Asquith says that the 'greatest interest of all countries is universal peace.' Now listen to Von Bernhardi, as endorsed by the Kaiser :—

Our people must learn to see that the maintenance of peace never can be, or may be, the goal of a policy.

The inevitableness, the idealism, and the blessing of war, as an indispensable and stimulating law of development, must be repeatedly emphasized.

Reflection thus shows not only that war is an unqualified necessity, but that it is justifiable from every point of view.

Might is the supreme right, and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war.

The lessons of history thus confirm the view that wars which have been deliberately provoked by far-seeing statesmen have had the happiest results.

Surely this last sentence is clear enough and true enough to cover the whole case. 'What further need have we of witnesses?' The present Inferno is nothing more or less than the embodiment and exhibition of the above brutally plain ideals. Do not Professors of 'culture' read the books published in their own tongue, which claim to be most important and have unmeasured influence? If not, surely they ought to do. But if they do, how are we to characterize their protests as to the meek simplicity and peace-loving purity of the German mind, when the whole atmosphere of their land reeks with sentiments such as those here given, which are only, as we shall see, echoes of the Treitschkean reiterations during the last twenty years?

The more closely, therefore, the whole situation immediately preceding the war is scrutinized, the

more indubitably it appears that the country which is almost wholly, if not altogether, responsible for the hell let loose now in Europe, is Germany. Whether the Kaiser himself so desired and determined, or whether he was only driven to it by the war-crew around him, under the special leadership of his eldest son, is practically irrelevant, and may be left for their own nation to decide.

(2) Preparations for the War.

Another great consideration, however, now calls for notice. If any doubt were left as to the justice and truth of the conclusion at which we have arrived concerning responsibility for the present Armageddon, this should suffice to dispel it. Whether it was the deliberate intention of Germany to provoke a European war during this year or not, it is manifest, beyond question, that, at an early period, 'the next war' was definitely contemplated, from the unmistakable, elaborate, comprehensive, and costly preparations for such an event which have been going on in that country for years. It has been, indeed, only quite recently that the evidences of the immensity of such preparations have come to light. The naval rivalry between Germany and England has certainly been made public enough, but almost all else has been overlooked by the trustful, peace-loving population of these islands. A very brief review, however, of what has been going on will suffice to indicate both the attitude and intention of the land concerning which the Theological Professors now assert, with such intense and pious indignation, that 'her ideal was peaceful

work.' Let us look at the nature of this peace. It must be appreciated on two lines, theoretical and practical.

(i.) As to the theoretical preparation for this war, it may with equal truth be called national, for the whole nation has been saturated with doctrines and ideals which could not possibly lead to any other end than war; war at an early period; and war especially with Great Britain. The extent to which such doctrines have succeeded, may be gauged by the utterances of Frau Ida Boy-Ed, the popular German novelist, in the *Staatszeitung*. It may be commended to the Theological Professors, as a fair specimen of what their conceptions of Christianity have produced.

Since the fourth of August I know what hatred is. Hatred came to us, creative hatred, buoyant hatred, which is at once a weapon and an inspiration. We can speak tranquilly and bravely of others. What are the poor French? A deceived and misused nation, which will become our allies sooner than is now thought possible. What is the Russian people? A stupid, fanatical mob. The Belgians, cheated and violated, are merely the victims of their neighbours from the west and south. All these enemies we fight powerfully and steadily, in the spirit of justified anger due to wounded patriotism. But England—gigantic, everlasting, inextinguishable hatred.¹

¹ As these pages go to press, the following significant specimen appears in the *Berliner Tageblatt* from an article by Herr Werner Sombart. It is necessary to mark such productions, because of the many who are given to saying that we are not at war with Germany, but only with the Kaiser and his swashbucklers:—'But with the English it is different. I am quite sure that the whole German people, from the last taxi driver to the highest official, are at one in their flaming hatred towards the English. It is England we feel to be our enemy. We are waging the war against England. We shall not

With this—which is typical—before us, we are not likely to be much moved by the religious fury with which ‘some of the most eminent biblical scholars in Germany’ revile us, for ‘daring to dispute the inner right of us and our Empire to invoke the assistance of God.’ Much, surely, must depend upon what God is invoked. If such sentiments as are exhibited in the above are to receive His assistance, then Christianity becomes a Nietzschean mockery, and all that is left is the reply of a well-known philosopher to an Ultramontane divine—‘Your God is my devil.’

But whence comes all this bitterness and wrath, which prepared the way for the present outbreak of war, in the minds of the people, as completely as—we will show in a moment—all the practical exigencies of the conflict were arranged, even to the last button? The answer will be found clearly enough in the list of books and papers, easily procurable, which are mentioned at the end of these pages. It were as impossible as unnecessary to summarize

consider the war terminated till England lies at our feet, crushed and humbled in her innermost consciousness. I believe that if England were granted an honourable peace, even the quiet German people would be driven into revolution. I have never seen in the Germans so much passionate feeling as at present if the word England is uttered.’ As reasons for this hatred the writer cites the treason of our cousins against us, the instinctive tendency of British policy to lying, the ostentatious say-nothing manner and boastfulness of the British Press, the open display of contempt for the poor relation. All these reasons, however, the writer describes as of secondary importance. He continues:—‘The main reason is that the spontaneous and elementary hatred towards England is rooted in the deepest depths of our own being. Where considerations of reason do not count, there the “irrational,” the instinct alone dominates. We hate in the English the hostile principle of the innermost and highest nature, and it is well that we are fully aware of this because we touch with this the vital meaning of this war.’

them here. A few outstanding names, with brief but accurate representations of their teachings and influence, will amply suffice for our purpose.

The first of these cannot but be Nietzsche, because his weird and virulent declamations, with their accompanying philosophy, unquestionably provided a strong foundation for others to build upon. Not that he was himself a German, or a lover of Germany. Pan-Germanism was as obnoxious to him as to the Allies. More severely than any other writer he denounced the shallow self-conceit which developed in Germany after the Franco-Prussian war, and poured scorn upon those whom he termed 'Culture Philistines.' His ideal 'Superman' was as little German as Christian. It resembled Christianity in that it was human rather than national. Seeing, however, that for Christianity the Superman is the saint, who in humility, tenderness, pity, loving-kindness, unselfishness, comes nearest to the angel, whilst for Nietzsche the Superman is really the super-beast, for whom brute force goes ever 'beyond good and evil,' and might constitutes the only right, it was inevitable that there should be such utter antagonism between the two as he expressed in avowing—'To my mind Christianity is the greatest of all conceivable corruptions.' But his brute philosophy was just the kind of doctrine to appeal to the German nation after 1870, when, through that tragically easy victory, Prussian pride and lust of conquest entered into the blood of the new empire as disastrously as cholera or typhoid germs too often into soldiers on the field. The whole German nation has developed that poison throughout its entire system

ever since. The disease which Dr. Emil Reich and others have called 'Germany's swelled head,' grew from more to more, under the influence of Nietzsche's gospel of unmitigated egoism. This is not the place to attempt any estimate of his philosophy in general. But a very slight acquaintance with the history of the evolution of the small upstart kingdom such as Prussia was at first,¹ into the German Empire from the time of Sedan, suffices to show how the main principles of 'the mad philosopher,' enforced and embellished by his undoubted genius, would commend themselves to the leaders of German thought and action at that time and onwards. Not only do we find in Bernhardi's dictum 'War is a biological necessity,' an echo of Nietzsche's 'War and courage have done more great things than love to one's neighbour,' but the whole attitude of the latter supplied just the very philosophical basis which the 'intellectuals' desired, and which the nation received with ambitious submissiveness from their authority. The truth concerning his influence could not be put more concisely than in the words of Professor Bussell, of Brasenose College, Oxford, in the following letter to the *Daily Mail* :—

Sir,—Several columns in newspapers of late have been occupied by a wholly unprofitable dispute as to Nietzsche's influence on the German character. In a philosopher who passed through many phases of thought before he died in an asylum, it is possible to isolate passages and doctrines which are wholly inconsistent. To vindicate one set at the expense of others is futile, because the plain fact is that

¹ For every person of ordinary intelligence, an excellent summary of the case will be found in Dr. Emil Reich's little book, *Germany's Swelled Head*, and in the two specially valuable small pamphlets by C. R. L. Fletcher, of Brasenose College, Oxford, referred to above.

even philosophers (like ordinary men) can and may alter their point of view.

It is quite irrelevant to show that he was a Pole, hated the Germans and loved the French; it is perfectly true, and also quite inconclusive. His real influence, however, is exerted upon the Germans, whom he detested, and in whose language he wrote. To that nation he came with the doctrine, singularly welcome after 1870, of the Overman, of the 'great blonde savage beast,' in whom the Prussian officer could not fail to see a flattering portrait of himself! To him, by right of might, belonged a world too long depraved and corrupted by the slave-morality, the feminine and unselfish virtues, of Christian teaching!

Himself a Slavonic scholar, of pure and regular life, but unbalanced and neurotic temperament, he had intense admiration for every quality and every vice he did not possess. He convinced himself that the gospel, with its Saviour and its moral standard, is the one enemy of man, making him feebly sentimental and democratic. To crush the weak (as Germany crushes Belgium) is to him in this mood almost a holy act, because brute and unscrupulous strength is the truest mark of the Divine Overman that is one day to emerge triumphant over the servile mob.

By all means let the British public be recommended to the perusal of the most original and poetic of modern writers, but our whole attitude during this war is simple proof that we have not imbibed a single one of his maxims; that in the future the world will be so reorganized that none can ever be realized.

F. W. BUSSELL.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

Next in order, but of even greater import, comes the influence of Treitschke. Thanks to cheap issues of the books by Bernhardi and Professor Cramb, the name and the work of Treitschke are now fairly well known in this country. He was born in 1834, ten years before Nietzsche, but died in 1896, four years sooner, whilst the latter was in his asylum. As Nietzsche was appointed Professor of classical

philology at Basle at the early age of twenty-four, so was Treitschke, at twenty-nine, made Professor of modern history at Freiburg. After short spells at Kiel and Heidelberg, he settled in Berlin. He suffered like Nietzsche from physical disabilities, but brought to bear great powers of mind, both by print and speech, on applying definitely to Germany the general principles of Nietzsche. Whereas the latter had said that—

War is as necessary to the State as the slave is to society. For it is so arranged that culture in its triumphal march benefits only a trivial minority of privileged mortals, and it is necessary that the slave service of the great masses be maintained, if one wish a full joy in becoming. So let us avow this cruel-sounding truth; slavery is necessary to culture,—

Treitschke endorsed this; but with the significant addition that Germany is to be the 'privileged minority,' whose 'culture' is to hold the rest of Europe, and indeed the world, in thralldom. Says Professor Cramb :—

Just as the greatness of Germany is to be found in the governance of Germany by Prussia, so the greatness and good of the world is to be found in the predominance there of German culture, of the German mind—in a word, of the German character. This is the ideal of Germany, and this is Germany's rôle as Treitschke saw it in the future.

The contribution which his ceaseless labours made to the more than readiness of Germany for the present conflict, is best expressed in his own words :—

If our empire has the courage to follow an independent colonial policy with determination, a collision of our interests with those of England is inevitable. It was natural and

logical that the new Great Power in Central Europe had to settle affairs with all Great Powers. We have settled our account with Austria-Hungary, with France, with Russia. The last settlement, the settlement with England, will probably be the lengthiest and most difficult.

General von Bernhardi's book has become so well known that there is no necessity to do more than mention it. That he is a thorough-going disciple of Treitschke goes without saying. His cynical plainness is unmistakable, and so far useful. It does not call for reply, but simply for careful notice. The longest chapter expresses in its title the main theme, 'World-power or Downfall.' The substance of his wonderfully well-informed and able plea, from the standpoint of the Fatherland, may be put into one sentence :—

We have fought in the last great wars for our national union and our position among the Powers of Europe ; we must now decide whether we wish to develop into and maintain a World Empire, and procure for German spirit and German ideas that fit recognition which has been hitherto withheld from them.

Such a sentiment appears internationally unobjectionable. If it could be dissociated from all the rest, which has, alas, now been so luridly made manifest, it might pass as the pardonable ambition of a great and growing people. But, alike in theory and practice, when scrutinized, it turns out to be something very different. Close by the extract just given, occurs also this avowal—'Under present conditions it is out of the question to attempt this increase of power by acquiring territory in Europe.' This also sounds meek and mild. But what are the

facts? Take first the unabashed declaration of Field Marshal Baron Bronsart von Schellendorf:—

Do not let us forget the civilizing task which the decrees of Providence have assigned to us. Just as Prussia was destined to be the nucleus of Germany, so the regenerated Germany shall be the nucleus of a future Empire of the West. And in order that no one shall be left in doubt, we proclaim from henceforth that our Continental nation has a right to the sea; not only to the North Sea, but to the Mediterranean and Atlantic. Hence we *intend to absorb* one after another all the provinces which neighbour on Prussia. We will successfully annex Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Northern Switzerland, and then Trieste and Venice; finally Northern France, from the Sambre to the Loire. This programme we fearlessly pronounce. It is not the work of a madman. The empire we intend to establish will be no Utopia. We have ready to our hands the means of founding it, and no coalition in the world can stop us.

When Bernhardi reads that, no doubt he will feel the same chagrin as his compatriots have felt since 1870, that they did not then demand from France a war indemnity of 2,000 millions rather than 200. But the rest of his book would prevent our taking seriously the above sentence which Baron Schellendorf so kindly translates for us. If, however, any comment were still needed, it is 'ready to our hands,' as, we shall see in a moment, all preparations were for to-day's actual struggle in Belgium and France. Count Bernstorff, the acute and tireless German Ambassador to the United States, whose incessant efforts to make that great country hate England and love Germany have of late so signally failed, was kind enough to communicate to a select circle, 'in a club,' the Kaiser's terms of peace which no doubt he has, as he declares, 'wrought out in real

communion with the Almighty.' With 'a bleeding heart' his Imperial Majesty informs the world that as the result of the present war—

1. Germany will take all French colonies, including the whole of Morocco, Algeria, and Tunis.

2. She will annex all the territory of the East of France along a line drawn from St. Valéry-sur-Somme as far as Lyons; that is to say, about one-quarter of France, with 15,000,000 inhabitants.

3. A war indemnity of £400,000,000.

4. A treaty of commerce for twenty-five years without any reciprocity on the part of Germany; after that period the terms of the Treaty of Frankfort of 1871—that is, the most-favoured-nation treatment—to obtain between the two countries.

5. Recruiting for the army to be suppressed in France for twenty-five years.

6. All French fortresses to be demolished.

7. France to hand over to Germany 3,000,000 rifles, 3,000 guns, and 40,000 horses.

8. All German patents to be accepted and binding in France, free of tax, for twenty-five years, without any reciprocity on the part of Germany.

9. France to abandon the agreement with Russia and England.

10. France to conclude a treaty of alliance with Germany for twenty-five years.

These conditions of peace Count von Bernstorff somewhat facetiously described as 'the German ten commandments.' 'We must sink France for ever as a nation,' he said. 'We must make her a Power like Turkey or Portugal, even if we have to kill 5,000,000 Frenchmen in order to do so.'

So now we know what Germany really wants; and the civilized world may be left, without any

comment here, to appreciate the benediction of the Kaiser's 'Ten Commandments.' At least, they afford proof positive, if such were needed, of the definite intentions of the chief war-lord and his cultured crew. The remark of the French newspaper *Le Temps* is abundantly warranted, when it says :—

Further proof is here afforded that Germany systematically prepared for the destruction of France, whilst the latter was nursing pacific delusions.

Whether it be true or not that Bernhardi's book was actually inspired by the Kaiser, at least there is no question concerning his approval of it. Nor about this national reception of it :—

It has been grossly and fatuously eulogized by scores of eminent writers, professors, and men in high military places in Germany. The German Crown Prince, in terms bordering upon hysteria, advised every German to read it. It has inspired literally thousands of leading articles, in both powerful and obscure newspapers, and it has been bought feverishly by all those who have the war-lust in their veins.

When, therefore, such pages as these, whose whole contention may be truthfully put into two or three of his own sentences—

Wars which have been deliberately provoked by far-seeing statesmen have had the happiest results. . . . Not only is war an unqualified necessity, but it is justifiable from every point of view. . . . Desire for peace has rendered most civilized nations anaemic, and marks a decay of spirit and political courage—

are circulated with gusto by the hundred thousand, what further need is there of proof that the present

war was definitely intended, and prepared for by the nation whose lachrymose Theological Professors are now bidding the modern world believe that 'her ideal was peaceful work'?

It is well, however, to have before us all the facts. Hence at least mention must be made of another influence not nearly so well known, but pointed out by Dr. Emil Reich. The name 'Chamberlain' is not unfamiliar in this country, but the work of Mr. Houston Stewart Chamberlain, in Germany, has certainly escaped the notice of most Englishmen. Dr. Reich's statement, therefore, as of one who knew, is worth noting :—

Chamberlain's book entitled *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* has had a most marvellous success with the Germans. Although heavy both in bulk and price, it sold in many many thousands of copies, and is by the majority of the Germans considered to be a higher revelation of truth unfathomable. Rich men have bought up thousands of this grotesque and absurd book, distributing them free of charge to hundreds of Public Libraries. The Kaiser publicly and warmly approved of it. It has given rise to quite a literature for or against it, and Chamberlain is one of the most popular and influential writers in Germany.

That was in 1907, so that the soil which had been broken up by Nietzsche, and ploughed by Treitschke, was well harrowed by Chamberlain, all ready for the Bernhardian seed, and the watering by the Kaiser's eldest son and heir. These latter might well approve, for the sum and substance of Chamberlain's book—which proclaimed, amongst other things, that Jesus was not a Jew, leaving Reimer to prove that

He was a German—is found in a public declaration of the Kaiser himself that

Nothing must be settled in this world, without the intervention of Germany and of the German Emperor.

With what pious rapture also some, at least, of the Theological Professors received and endorsed such sentiments, may be fairly estimated—we may say ‘fairly’ with deliberation, since the recently published utterances of such men as Harnack, Dryander, Schmoller, &c.—from the following delightfully Christian oration of Professor Lezius in regard to Poland :—

Solomon has said, Do not be too good, do not be too just. The Polish press should simply be annihilated. All Polish societies should be suppressed without the slightest apology being made for such a measure. This summary procedure should be likewise applied to the French and Danish press, as well as to the societies of Alsace, Lorraine, and Schleswig-Holstein. Especially should no consideration whatever be shown to anything relating to the Poles. The Poles should be looked upon as helots. They should be allowed but three privileges—to pay taxes, serve in the army, and shut their jaws.

Let any honest mind face the fact of that lovely ‘Christian’ utterance—for fact it is, and only too typical—and then say if it is to be wondered at that unbelievers by the million in that land should pour scorn upon religion in general, and upon Christianity in particular.

All citizens of these realms who wish to appreciate the intellectual and social preparations for the present war, which have been proceeding for years on the Continent, should procure and study Mr. F. W.

Wile's volume *Men Around the Kaiser*. It is quite as significant as Bernhardt's publication. Of one only need mention here be made out of these thirty-one vignettes. Dr. Ernst von Heydebrand, the leader of the Agrarian element whose political label is Conservative, is known as 'the uncrowned King of Prussia.' Mark now his Parliamentary performance in 1911, after the Morocco business :—

He recalled the glories of Prussia, and reminded the Government that Germans had fought best when they fought alone and against a world in arms. He demanded to know the why and the wherefore of the Empire's colossal armaments on land and sea, if the Fatherland were to retreat at a critical moment. A young officer in the uniform of the Death's Head Hussars sat in the royal box of the house, hanging intently upon every rasping word that fell from that little Conservative Leader's scolding lips. It was the Crown Prince. When Heydebrand finished, the future Kaiser joined spontaneously in the thunder of applause which rolled over the entire house.

When to all that this scene represents, is added the ceaseless work and influence of such others as Admiral von Tirpitz, Admiral von Koestler, Prince Henry of Prussia, Alfred Ballin, Prince von Buelow, Count von Bernstorff, Krupp von Bohlen, Von der Goltz, and a host more of the same mind, it would seem to require a far stronger man than the Kaiser, for all his egoism, to be proof against such forces and tendencies to Pan-Germanism, even if he had so desired.

The 'host' just mentioned is no fiction. It points again to the 'Pan-German League' which was formed in 1911, as mentioned above. It must by no means be left out of account, seeing that besides

its half-million of influential members, Mr. Fletcher reminds us that—

It has founded, encouraged, or affiliated, an enormous number of lesser patriotic Leagues, some of them with queer names like 'Odin, the heathen god of primitive Germany,' 'The Hammer League,' 'The German Speech League,' 'The War League,' 'The Colonial League.' It is in close relation with the enormously popular Navy League, and its last triumph has been the ironically named 'League for the Defence of Germany.' Most of these Leagues have ladies' branches, and juvenile branches, as well as their main society.

Put all these together. Such reminders are but the faintest and feeblest hints of ceaseless immeasurable, irrepressible, popular agencies, which have been assiduously at work, as in no other country in the world, during the last quarter of a century, throughout the whole nation whose army triumphed at Sedan. No impartial mind can even approximately estimate this whole ferment, without seeing that the train for a vast explosion had been as completely laid in the thoughts and desires of the German people, as was ever done in actual warfare. When such has been made, well we know that a little child may fire it. But the responsibility for the following ruin will rest, not with the child, but with the layers of the train.

(ii.) Let us now proceed to mark how the practical preparation kept pace with the intellectual. Details cannot and need not be here supplied. They may be abundantly gleaned from the daily press. It will suffice to enumerate the various items about which

there is no question. When, some four years ago, Mr. Blatchford wrote in the *Daily Mail* :—

Germany is now preparing for war upon a greater scale than she ever before attempted, and is at the same time professing peace to us. Germany behaved in the same way to Austria and to France, and when occasion served she fell upon her victims, defeated them, and annexed their territory,

he was only sneered at for his pains. But then, as ever, sneers did not touch facts.¹ In at least a dozen different directions, actual and elaborate preparations for war have been going on, regardless of cost, whilst the Kaiser has posed as the Peace-maker of Europe. The following list is, of course, far from exhaustive. But it is more than sufficient to silence for ever the bleatings of theologians and denunciations of Professors in Europe, on behalf of Germany's injured innocence, as well as the plausible mendacities of Count Bernstorff in America, which we must presently more closely consider.

(i.) The efficiency of the German army as a fighting machine is too well known to need comment. Nor could any complaint be uttered, if it were only honestly intended for the defence of the Fatherland. But the many millions recently spent upon it—the army budget for 1913 alone amounted to £100,000,000—had manifestly more than defence in view. If the real cause of the army's immediate

¹ The summary by this writer of the whole present situation, published at a penny, deserves to be pondered by every man and woman in Great Britain. As also does another publication at the same price issued by the Clarion Press, entitled *Prussia's Devilish Creed*, by Mr A. M. Thompson.

readiness recently be honestly desired, there is no difficulty at all in supplying answer. It was indeed a marvel of efficiency and organization which permitted four millions of soldiers to be transported in a few days from every part of the empire to the borders of Germany. But it proved too much, For as Mr. Douglas Sladen points out¹ :—

The clockwork mobilization of four million men goes far to prove that if the war was not sought by Germany, Germany was perfectly certain that the path it was pursuing might bring it to war at any moment.

Was, then, such a contingency regarded with horror, or did the German heart bleed over the possibility of war as the Kaiser's did over Louvain? Let Bernhardi answer :—

France must be so completely crushed that she will never again come across our path.

Let it, then, be the task of our diplomacy so to shuffle the cards that we may be attacked by France, for then there would be reasonable prospect that Russia for a time would remain neutral. If we wish to bring about an attack by our opponents, we must initiate a policy which, without attacking France, will so prejudice her interest or those of England that both these States would feel themselves compelled to attack us.

With that, then, in view, the millions of German soldiers were kept in such a state of organized efficiency, that when mobilization was proclaimed

¹ See p. 67 of his true and scathing comments upon the falsities of the book written for American consumption only, entitled *The Truth About Germany*, about which more presently.

on August 1, the very next morning German troops invaded the neutral territory of Luxemburg. In a word, the finest war machine the world has ever seen, was kept as ready for immediate action as one of their vaunted guns waiting for its electric fuse.

(ii.) As to the navy, a whole volume could but do scanty justice to what has been done during the last twenty years. The increase of the Fatherland's navy cost from £6,000,000 in 1898 to £23,650,000 in 1913, speaks for itself. The first chapter in Mr. Wile's valuable book above mentioned, reveals the man—Admiral von Tirpitz—to whom, even more than to the Kaiser, this marvellous and significant development is due. Bearing in mind that the army budget for 1913 already amounted to £100,000,000, it becomes too manifest to call for words, that to permit the extra navy burden, there must have been both some very special and tremendous purpose in view, and also some most potent way of infusing with it the national mind.

Each of these suggestions is overwhelmingly illustrated in fact. The chief article of the Kaiser's creed is well known, viz. that 'Germany's future lies on the water.' He has in his brother Henry a fine seconder to that sentiment. When the Kaiser, with characteristic gentleness, said to the fleet departing from Kiel to the East in 1897—'If any one dares to interfere with our good right, ride in with the mailed fist'—the dutiful brother replied—'Neither glory nor laurels attract me. My one desire is to proclaim the gospel of your Majesty's sacred person in foreign parts.' But a much more potent force even than brotherly devotion has been

working throughout the Fatherland. When the Kaiser proclaimed that 'the ocean was essential to Germany's greatness,' and that the more Germans who went to sea the better—

It was Von Tirpitz who piloted ever-recurring programmes through the tortuous waters of party politics. But it is the Navy League which has kept the conscience of the country awake, which has aroused the nation's fears and fanned its passions as occasion demanded.

This Navy League has a million and a quarter members; there are 3,500 local branches throughout the country; it has an annual income of some £25,000; and its magazine, *Die Flotte*, takes its message to at least 360,000 Germans at home and abroad every month. The potent personality which has made this so mighty an agency is Admiral von Koestler, the 'grand old man' of the German fleet. Through his nursing of the League has come to pass the marvellous change in Germany's naval status, which has made its fleet to-day second only to that of Britain in the whole world. But this very fact betrays the cause. Bernhardi's chapter on 'Preparation for the Naval War' will supply all further information required, if one should ask, as is inevitable—Why all this sudden, feverish, unprecedented, colossal outlay?

I believe that the general situation makes war with England inevitable, even if our naval force in the shortest time reaches its statutory strength in modern men-of-war. My view, therefore, is that we must first of all lay the solid foundation without which any successful action against the superior forces of the enemy is unthinkable.

There we have it in a sentence. Perhaps the most telling summary, in brief space, of the rest of the evidence of Germany's purposeful naval preparation is given in the chapter (III) on 'The Evidence of Facts' in Mr. Blatchford's little booklet, which every citizen should read.¹ We need only mention here four other items.

(iii.) What about Heligoland? An innocent little island in the North Sea, opposite the Schleswig-Holstein which was snatched by brute force from Denmark by the 'mailed fist' in 1864. In 1890 it was ceded to Germany—with strange lack of foresight—by our Government under Lord Salisbury, in exchange for the comparatively useless Zanzibar and Witu in East Africa. But it has been transformed since then by the Kaiser's friends, at a cost of some sixty millions, into an impregnable fortress, the usefulness of which at such a time as the present any child can see, but only naval experts can appreciate. Commanding as it does the entrance to the rivers Elbe and Weser—on which Bremen and Hamburg are situated—also the Kiel Canal and the naval station Wilhelmshaven, it may well be termed the Gibraltar of the North. Germany's 'wisdom of the serpent' herein requires no demonstration.

(iv.) The Kiel Canal is now well known; its importance to German shipping can scarcely be exaggerated. But why widen it so extensively? And why construct seventeen docks capable of taking the largest vessels? The present war sufficiently explains.

¹ *Germany and England* (Daily Mail office, one penny).

(v.) Then there is Emden, with its 'long quays,' concerning which it has been too truly said :—

At Emden, which is a small obscure town, every preparation has been made for the embarkation of enormous masses of troops. Against whom could such troops be used? Not against Russia; not against France, which could be so much more easily assailed by land. No, the long quays were made for the embarkation of an army for the invasion of England. If the long quays were made for any other purpose, they were made by fools. Now the Germans are not fools.¹

(vi.) We have heard more than enough about the mines with which the North Sea—in definite violation of the Hague Convention—has been indiscriminately sown.² But has all this been done since the war broke out? Only a German Professor would be equal to that assertion. But even he could not deny that if mines had not been to hand, already prepared in enormous quantities, such indiscriminate sowing of the ocean with deadliness could never have been possible. Surely only those who are so blind that they will not see, can doubt the purpose of these mines. The same, of course, applies to the submarines, of whose potency for destructive purposes tragic evidence has already been afforded.

If it be remarked that in all the items of naval strength this country has also expended large sums, and has led the way in the production of

¹ *Germany and England* (R. Blatchford), p. 14.

² It will of course be borne in mind, that Britain only took part in this mine laying when driven to it by the indiscriminate and treacherous action of Germany. Sowing such engines of destruction in all directions under the deceitful guise of innocent merchant ships and neutral flags, is a procedure which only a nation mad with Machiavellian fury and Bernhardian ruthlessness would adopt.

Dreadnoughts, the reason is clear and true, without being sinister. Britain is insular, and must live by its ocean traffic, which unfortunately needs to be guarded and protected. What is more than that, has been thrust upon us—in plain statement—only by the threatening developments of Germany above hinted at, in association with the history of other German proceedings during recent years, and downright avowals rather than hints as to their future programme.

(vii.) As regards the provision of war materials, the very mention of the name of 'Krupp' is quite sufficient to convey the general idea of vast preparation. But what has happened in particular at Liège, Namur, Rheims, Antwerp, and other places, calls for special explanation. It is only too easily forthcoming. The greatest industrial organization the world has ever seen, is concerned with the most effective way of slaughtering men and women. It is purely and solely a colossal factory for the production of death and destruction on the largest scale. If theology needed any witness to the reality of sin in human nature, it is only necessary to visit Essen, in the valley of the Ruhr, in Western Prussia. There, a woman holds controlling interest in an establishment which brings her in more than a million pounds per year. It employs 75,000 workmen, representing a community of 300,000, and pays not less than five millions a year in wages. The husband of the woman, the skilled and tireless manager of the whole concern, is 'Dr. Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach.' From this mammoth firm the German army and navy have bought, since 1851, not less than 30,000 guns. It must be borne

in mind, of course, that 'guns,' in this connexion, does not mean rifles, but much larger weapons. How large, has been tragically exhibited of late, in that heaviest artillery which has overborne resistance at Namur and Antwerp—the celebrated 16in. guns which require concrete beds to bear their recoil. It has been recently stated in public that only eight of these murderous weapons have been made, and these, before the war, were carefully concealed in subterranean stores at Essen. The point here is that this enormous factory had for its function such preparation of warlike material as could only be intended for a titanic struggle, in accordance with the ideals of Treitschke, Bernhardi, and the Crown Prince, not to say the Kaiser also.

(viii.) Again, the manufacture of Zeppelins on the large scale, in addition to other developments of aviation, points in the same direction. Whether they will yet be used for a definite attack upon England, remains to be seen. Of their intention and multiplication no secret is now made.

(ix.) The wonderful rapidity of mobilization to which reference was just made, leads us also to note another significant fact. Troops require trains, and trains need railways. How did it happen that these were just where they were wanted when the time came? The simplest answer is the truest. Because they were prepared on purpose. The converging network of railways in Western Germany could not have come to pass by chance. Like so many other things which now have emerged into notice, they show that whilst other nations slept in the hope, in the trustfulness of maintaining peace, Germany was preparing, on Bernhardi's lines, for just such

an outbreak as he foreshadowed—and desired. That this last word is justified, let his own words bear witness :—

We can secure Germany's position on the Continent of Europe, only if we succeed in smashing the Triple Entente, and in humiliating France and giving her that position to which she is entitled, as we cannot arrive at an agreement with her for mutual co-operation.

How, in the face of such an unblushing incitement to 'smashing' a neighbouring nation, the Theological Professors can so vociferously now protest, on Germany's behalf, that 'her ideal was peaceful work,' must perhaps be left to their own consciences. But whether they are consciously deceivers or not, it is surpassingly difficult to think of them as deceived.

(x.) Another interesting item just—literally—exhumed, is the discovery at Antwerp, as at Maubeuge and Namur, at Dunkirk—and in England at Willesden—of already prepared beds of concrete, on which the carefully concealed heaviest ordnance might be placed whenever opportunity arrived. The *Star* may well comment hereupon :—

These statements prove that Germany had long in advance deliberately planned the violation of Belgian neutrality. They also suggest that no nation can safely trust Germans who are enjoying their hospitality.¹

(xi.) If there were any grounds for questioning this last remark, they would be dispelled in a moment

¹ The devices which have come to light, in order to the construction of these concrete foundations during a time of peace, can only be called diabolically clever.

when attention is directed to the system of espionage which Germany has developed, and which, both on the Continent and in this country, has so shown itself of late as to be without precedent, measure, or end. There may be, no one will deny, honest and trustworthy Germans living in other countries. But it is simply impossible to be sure of them. 'Naturalization' counts for nothing. Men in high positions in our cities, who have been naturalized for a quarter of a century, and have enjoyed every privilege of an English citizen, as well as received every mark of confidence and respect, have now been discovered in the very act of doing all that lay in their power to afford facilities for invading these shores.¹

As for the work of spies in the actual conduct of the war, the daily press gives sufficiently emphatic account. But this vast and intricate system of organized meanness has not been, could not be, developed in a day. That is absolutely certain. It has been very cleverly and tirelessly wrought out, and money has been no object. Anything, according to the Bernhardian régime, is lawful and honourable, if only it accomplishes Germany's end—*Deutschland über alles*.

(xii.) The last but hardly least proof of German treachery comes from far away. A Dutch lieutenant in South Africa has just unmasked a plot as well as disgraced himself, by employing the men

¹ So manifest has become the ubiquitous menace of these German traitors, that not only has our Government come to see how much more stringent measures are required, but substantial warrant is afforded for Mr. Blatchford's plea—which might otherwise seem ruthless—that 'the *only* sensible and safe way is to arrest *all* Germans, beginning with the richest, the most influential, and the most seemingly loyal.'

and means entrusted to him, as a British South African officer, in the effort to stir up rebellion against British rule in that country. He acknowledges that he has been provided with German guns and money, and poses as a German 'general.' But the only significant feature in Lieutenant Maritz's fiasco is the revelation of German intrigue, such as was certainly not born yesterday, but will as certainly fail to-morrow.¹ It is only another of the host of Kaiserian mistakes. Whether all the memories of the Boer War have died out or not, the Dutch nation, both in Europe and across the sea, know the German attitude too well to desire ever to come under its sway. So is South Africa loyal still, and it remains to be seen what Holland will do or bear when, as seems to be likely, once more the nation that considers itself divinely appointed to rule the world, shows its conception of the divine by trampling again on the truth and honour which should protect neutral nations from invasion.

When all these and other similar considerations are duly weighed, they show plainly enough, for any honest mind, whether Germany meant to bring about war.

(3) *The Barbarous Conduct of the War.*

It was quite natural that a war which was purposely brought about, and was commenced by setting

¹ The practical collapse of this German-engineered rebellion through the splendid loyalty of General Botha and his co-patriots is announced as these lines go to press. Happily the Boers, as a whole, are no more disposed than the Belgians to trample on truth and honour, and regard treaties as scraps of paper.

honour at naught, should go on to exhibit features—on that side—which leave the ordinary horrors of war far behind, in sheer and loathsome abominations of savagery. To speak of what, beyond all controversy, has been done by German troops to the peaceful, innocent, helpless folk of Belgium, as ‘brutality,’ would be a gross libel upon the beasts. No beast would, or could, ever have done such things. To call it devilry—as Dean Inge does—is too mild, for we do not know enough about devils to deem them capable of such things. In regard to barbarisms which reduce to blatant mockery the professorial rant about ‘German culture,’ it is only necessary to mention the names of Louvain and Rheims. But abominable as are these proceedings, they fade into trifles by comparison with the damnable atrocities perpetrated upon human beings. Of course, ‘looting’—which is but a technical term for wholesale robbery and destruction of property—has been done without measure by the German Huns. But as the citizens of this country, protected by the fleet, know nothing of the horrors of such wanton desolation, and do not realize what war means to these afflicted districts, so, without some concrete examples, the savageries of these human fiends for whose bloody work the Kaiser calls upon his friends to thank God, cannot be apprehended. When we say that no conception of hell itself can surpass the actual doings of German soldiers at Liège, Louvain, Dinant, Aerschot, Senlis, Termonde, Maubeuge, and numberless other unnamed places, it seems absolutely necessary to do two things—exemplify, and prove them.

The latter has been done. The attempts of

certain Professors in Berlin to assert exaggeration, have been shown to be but lying excuses; not only by the official report of the Belgian Legation, but by eye-witnesses now well known, and by actual confessions in private letters found on German soldiers. Language fails to estimate these abominations. But they must be named, and not forgotten. A simple but infernal list can only too easily be—partly, not completely—given. Wholesale murder of innocent civilians on the slightest false pretence; drunken brutality and savagery without excuse or parallel in civilization; fiendish cruelty to old women, old men, and children; indescribable but damnable outrages upon young women and girls; murderous bombs thrown upon unarmed cities; the same upon well-known hospitals; dastardly treatment of and actual murder of the wounded in numberless cases; ambulances, plainly marked with red cross, deliberately fired upon; prisoners and women used as shields by forcing them in front of the firing line, trusting to the chivalry of the enemy; the white flag used as a device for deadly assault; red cross wagons employed as carriages for machine guns; miners, known to be below ground at their work, murdered wholesale by closing in the mines; if such a list—absolutely proved to be far less than the realities—is not enough to make devils blush for shame, then Nietzsche is right, that the distinction between good and evil is a petty fiction.

It is in very deed the pollution of paper to print actualities hereupon. But it must be done, to some small extent, for the truth's sake, that this nation and the modern world may know against what the Allies are fighting, and that the peace-at-any-price party

may be made to see to what, in the name of a false piety, they would expose those whom they ought as men, let alone as Christians, to protect.

The verification of all these cases by name, date, place, is absolute. An eye-witness at Liége :—

A Dutch cigarette manufacturer, himself maltreated 'saw a party of 300 Belgian civilians, among whom were old men and lads of 14, driven at the point of the bayonet to a remote spot near the station, where they were all shot before his eyes. Amongst them were the mayor, two aldermen, the rector of the university, two deans, and many police inspectors.

From official report, signed by the President, members, and Secretaries, on first-hand evidence :—

LOUVAIN AND NEIGHBOURHOOD—FROM AN
EYE-WITNESS.

All the men in the village were taken prisoners; all the doors of the houses were broken, and the women left defenceless. Many of them were raped; others took refuge in my château. On August 21, at 11 o'clock, two boys and a man from Brussels were stopped at Dieghem by German soldiers. They were obliged by two officers to undress and stand quite naked in all kinds of positions in the field, where disgusting scenes took place at the order of the Germans. This has been sworn to me by the victims themselves and other witnesses before the curé of my village. They even said that a few of the German soldiers present were crying with shame.

Report of Commission of Inquiry communicated September 11 to the Minister of Justice, and signed as above :—

In a neighbouring village, Corbeck Loo, on Wednesday, August 19, a young woman, whose husband was with the army, and some of her relations were surprised by a band of German soldiers. The persons who were with her were

locked up in a deserted house, while she herself was dragged into another cottage, where she was raped by five soldiers successively.

In the same village, on August 20, German soldiers fetched from their house a young girl about 16 years old and her parents. They drove them to a small deserted country house, and while some of them held back the father and mother the others forced the girl on to the lawn in front of the house and raped her successively. Finally they stabbed her in the breast with their bayonets. When abandoned by them she was brought back to her parents' house, and the following day received extreme unction from the parish priest, and was taken to the hospital at Louvain in a dying condition.

At Dinant, report by M. A. Terwagne, brother of the Deputy of Antwerp :—

These savage acts were only the prelude to the fate which the horde of brigands were reserving for the unhappy town of Dinant. On the following day large masses of troops arrived, and were guilty of the most abominable atrocities which have ever been recorded. The Germans forced open the doors of the houses and murdered every one they found within. There was Victor Poncelet done to death in the presence of his wife and six children; there were members of the firm of Capelle murdered in cold blood. In every house a fresh crime was committed, while the women were driven half naked to a monastery, where they were kept for three days half dead with hunger and fear.

Some workmen of Leffe hid in a drain near the large cotton mill, the manager of which, M. Himmer, was killed. There were about sixty of them, and when the Germans discovered them they were all shot, although not one of them was armed. In the Faubourg Saint Pierre a number of men hid in the cellar of the brewery owned by the brothers Nicaise, old men of over 70, and their nephew, Jules Monin. The barbarians had pity on none. All of them, about forty in number, fell under the German bullets.

Over two hundred men and lads, old men of 75 and boys of 12, fathers and sons together, were driven on to the Place

d'Armes. In order that the work might be carried out more quickly a machine gun was brought up. It was here that Xavier Wasseige, the manager of the Banque de la Meuse, was killed, together with his two sons, and here too died Camille Fisette and his little boy aged 12. Then they set to work methodically on the destruction of the town, using bombs to set fire to the houses. Soon nothing but a heap of ashes remained. That is what the bandits of the great empire which wishes to rule Europe have done to one of the most picturesque towns of Belgium. The monster who presided over these abominable atrocities was Lieutenant-Colonel Beeger.

No doubt by this time the hero just named has received, from the Kaiser with the bleeding heart, the order of the Iron Cross, and an exhortation to give thanks to the Almighty.

But four assertions must here be made with all emphasis. (i.) There is no exaggeration in these hellish records. Rather, the tithe has not been told, and the whole truth never will be. (ii.) There was no military necessity for these abominations, and they have neither place nor justification in the sad enough programme of civilized war. (iii.) They cannot be dismissed as the mere drunken freaks of a depraved minority in the German host. No one doubts that there are true and tender and honourable men amidst the German hosts. But that is nothing to the point. (iv.) The real truth to be appreciated is that these infernal savageries were definite part of the war programme of the apostles of 'culture.' That they were well known and intentional, is proved on unimpeachable grounds. First, the unmistakable declarations of the Kaiser and his statesmen. A typical specimen will suffice.

His Imperial Majesty in 1890 :—

Those who oppose me I will dash in pieces.

Address to troops in 1900 :—

Quarter will not be given. Whoever falls into your hands is forfeit to you, just as a thousand years ago the Huns under King Etzel (Attila) made a name for themselves which is still mighty in tradition and story.

To troops, order issued Aix-la-Chapelle, August 14, 1914 :—

It is my royal and imperial command that you concentrate your energies for the immediate present upon one single purpose, and that is that you address all your skill and all the valour of my soldiers to exterminate first the treacherous English, and to walk over General French's contemptible little army.

Upon this the comment of *The Times* is well deserving endorsement :—

The character of the war which the Kaiser and his plundering bandits are waging against us is very well exemplified by the above order, which shows the particular hatred and malice which he and his bear towards us. We are not only to be beaten but exterminated, and it is no doubt *directly due to this order* that the Kaiser's hordes stop at nothing, whether within the rules of war or outside them, to carry out the wishes of their vengeful chief.

In this light we know how to appreciate his sermon at Bethlehem in October, 1898 :—

The world-renewing power of the gospel urges us to Christian resignation, to the practice of unselfish love for all men; and it gives us a sure promise that if we faithfully hold fast to the pure doctrine of the gospel, even the gates of hell shall not prevail against our Evangelical Church.

Perhaps the best note upon this will be the advice of Bismarck. At all events it will be illuminating :—

Above all you must inflict on the inhabitants of invaded towns the maximum of suffering, so that they may become sick of the struggle. In every case the principle which guided our general was that war must be made terrible to the civil population, so that it may sue for peace.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that a letter received from two English ladies in France a few weeks since, contains the following passage :—

Between Paris and Dieppe we again stopped at stations where nurses were waiting the arrival of the French, English, and Belgian wounded. We talked with women nurses who told us (as women) of atrocities committed on Belgian women while German soldiers stood by and laughed. These women were then being actually nursed by those who spoke to us. We asked, as all were asking, what reason the German soldiers gave for behaving with such brutality. A woman nurse told us that the Germans she had nursed *all* said they had only obeyed orders. They had been told to commit all possible atrocities; so to terrorize France and England that they would sue for peace.

(v.) Evidently, therefore, the execration of the modern world must not rest alone on the poor brutes who did the vile things, but upon those who ordered them to be done, that is, the Kaiser himself,¹

¹ Lecturing on the war at the Lyceum, Father Malone, a prominent New York priest, said—' This unprecedented disaster is the fault of a single man, who is the troubler of the world. Upon the Kaiser, autocrat by the divine right of kings, the full responsibility rests. With tremendous vanity and grotesque miscalculation, he defies the nations that must slowly encircle him, and, as from a maniac, wrest the sword

with his son and staff. These are the real robbers and murderers, through whom a fair and peaceful and happy land is now a heart-crushing desolation, blasted with the memories of ruined homes, burnt cities, ravished women, and tortured old men and children. If proof of the justness of this condemnation were needed, it is found beyond answer in the damning fact that either at the beginning, or at any time after, a distinct order from the Kaiser or his staff would have prevented this whole orgy of hell. They did not stop it; because they did not want to. They were, in a word, such fools as well as villains, as to think that atrocities like these would 'terrorize' Belgian, and French, and English hearts! They will learn the opposite to the full before the tragedy closes.

(4) *The Allies did not Want War; it was Forced Upon Them.*

So far as France and Belgium are concerned, this statement needs no proof. The heroism of Belgium in standing up to the bigger German bully for truth, and honour, and liberty, will never be forgotten in the world's history. The terms of the French alliance with Russia made it equally inevitable, if honour counted for anything, to side with Russia, when the latter was driven to war with Austria. The whole case, so far as Russia is

from him. Germany is a nation out of which spirituality has been wrung dry. It is built on philosophy, and has lost all mysticism. Three thousand professors of German universities ridicule God, though the Kaiser calls so glibly on Him.'

responsible, may then be truthfully summarized in a series of fateful steps.

(i.) The murder of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand on June 23, 1914.

(ii.) Austrian demands from Servia for satisfaction and punishment of the crime. 'No independent nation has ever been called on to accept a greater humiliation.'

(iii.) Austria's ultimatum to Servia on July 23 demanding answer in forty-eight hours.

(iv.) Very conciliatory reply by Servia.

(v.) Warning to Austria from Russia, that it could not stand by and see Servia crushed.

(vi.) Austria showed that a settlement was not desired; war made inevitable of set purpose.

(vii.) Austria plainly supported by Germany.

(viii.) France made plain that if Russia were driven to war on behalf of Servia, she would be compelled, as an honourable nation, to support Russia.

(ix.) July 28, Austria declared war upon Servia.

(x.) Germany refused to meet representatives of Britain, France, and Italy, to discuss the situation with a view to maintaining peace.

(xi.) The 'infamous proposals' of Germany necessarily rejected by Mr. Asquith.

(xii.) July 31, Britain asked for confirmation of Belgian neutrality from three Governments. France gave assurance the same day. Belgium the next day. Germany, no reply.

(xiii.) German demand, with twelve hours' ultimatum, from Russia to cease mobilization; although Germany had already done more than Russia, and France nothing at all.

(xiv.) August 2, Sunday morning, German troops

invaded Luxemburg, an avowedly neutral territory.

(xv.) Three distinct warnings from Britain, July 30, 31, August 1, that the violation of Belgian neutrality would be regarded as a *casus belli*.

(xvi.) Telegram from Czar of Russia to King George — 'In this solemn hour I wish to assure you once more, that I have done all in my power to avert war.' Comment of Foreign Office¹ :—

It is right to say that His Majesty's Government believe this to be a true statement of the attitude both of Russia and France throughout this crisis. On the other hand, with every wish to be fair and just, it will be admitted that the response of Germany and Austria gave no evidence of a sincere desire to save the peace of Europe.

The *New York Tribune* does not put the case so mildly :—

History can afford no more glaring instance of the welfare of an innocent and neutral nation being sacrificed to the perfidy and ambitious policy of a more powerful neighbour. The more complete is Germany's triumph over Belgium, the deeper will be the stain on Germany's honour.

To ordinary sight it is difficult to see where 'Germany's honour' comes in at all. But the sentiment of this American journal may be commended to Count Bernstorff, Herr Dernburg, Professor Munsterberg, and their friends, the aim of whose special collaboration in the States, is to blacken England and whitewash Germany.

¹ *Great Britain and the European Crisis*, p. ix.

(5) *This Country had Overwhelming Reasons for Taking Part in the Conflict.*

For details of proof of this statement, reference must be made to other publications.¹ They entirely warrant the avowal that, both negatively and positively, the guilt for the letting loose of hell in Europe rests upon the Kaiser and his counsellors. Sir Edward Cook's impressive booklets cannot here be summarized, but they amply justify the press comment :—

The evidence afforded by these pamphlets is damning. Great Britain sought the path of peace, and Germany took the path which has led to war.

Negatively, the special attempts made so earnestly by Sir Edward Grey to maintain peace, were frustrated by Germany. The only approach on Germany's part to an effort in that direction was at once so evasive, sinister, and suspicious, that it richly merited the rejection it met with, and the epithet bestowed upon it by Mr. Asquith as 'infamous.' To have yielded to it would inevitably have branded this country for ever as dishonourable, selfish, and cowardly.

Positively, the overwhelming reasons for this country's entering into the strife, were fourfold.

(i.) A solemn national protest as to the value and necessity of truth in international relationships. If treaties are only 'scraps of paper,' to be torn up at selfish convenience, there is an end to civilization as well as to morality.

¹ See especially the Government booklet *Great Britain and the European Crisis*; also *How Great Britain Strove for Peace*, by Sir Edward Cook (Macmillan, twopence); *Why Britain is at War*, by the same author—both illuminating and convincing.

(ii.) A nation that tramples on honour deserves to perish. The honour of this great empire was pledged to support, and if necessary defend, the weaker little country whose neutrality had been assented to by Germany as well as by England and France. To stand by unmoved and unmoving, whilst a national bully crushed the smaller people, merely to secure advantage in trying to smash France, would have been dishonourable and mean-spirited to the last degree.

(iii.) The greatest need and blessing of civilization is liberty. Without that, a nation's life neither can be nor is worth preserving. But there is no manner of doubt, as has been shown above, that the mad notion which has been of late years instilled into the German nation, is that it should lord it over all the world. That means assuredly, in the present case, that if the Kaiser's war machine had been permitted to smash France, by way of Belgium, Great Britain would have had to share the same fate, and all Europe would be brought under the bondage of a brutal militarism, with consequences far worse than slavery ancient or modern.¹

(iv.) This plain truth emerges ; that Britain was

¹ An interesting illustration of this may be produced here from the behaviour of Major Dieckmann, in command of the German forces at Grivegnée, near Liège, where an 'important notice was posted up containing seventeen items. Amongst these, with the death penalty assigned for disobedience, were giving up all arms; all inhabitants must be indoors after 7 p.m., and lights kept burning; all houses must be open to inspection; lists of hostages must be supplied, who are liable to be shot at any moment if a disturbance should arise; all civilians moving about must take off their hats on meeting a German officer, and must salute every German soldier; any one failing in this must expect the soldier to exact respect from him by any method,' &c., &c. How that kind of régime would suit the people of these realms need not here be estimated.

driven to take share in this dreadful *mêlée* not alone on grounds of truth, and honour, and liberty, but for sheer right to exist. It is as certain as the brag-gadocio of the Kaiser, and the swagger of his war-lords, together with the universally instilled hatred of England throughout Germany can make it, that if its brute militarism had been allowed to do as it would to Belgium, and then grind France under its heel, it could and would so have squared Russia, as to set its hands of blood and iron free to compass the ruin of this country also. Whatever may be imagined as to the issue of such a task, it is as certain as the blackness of the darkest night, that the consequences to this country would have been awful to contemplate. The atrocities above mentioned, which the German anger at its defeated plan inflicted upon poor Belgium, would be but mild happenings compared with what we might expect, if the crew around the Kaiser, including himself and his sweet son, ever obtained the chance to wreak their vengeance upon England.

Hence the allegation is abundantly justified, that Great Britain had overwhelming reasons for joining, however unwillingly, sadly, and solemnly, in the present unprecedented and horrible war.

(6) *German Lies.*

This section of our necessary survey needs a volume to itself. A large portion of it is already exhibited in the volume entitled *The Secret White Paper—Germany's Great Lie*, exposed by Mr. Douglas Sladen.¹ The perusal of these two hundred

¹ Hutchinson & Co., 1s. net.

pages smites one almost with despair. That a book such as *The Truth About Germany—Facts About the War*, could be produced and issued by some forty-five leading ‘intellectuals’ of that country, including Theological and other Professors, in face of all that we now know to be true, might almost drive one to conclude that intellectuality is but a mammoth lie, morality a mocking delusion, and religion a canting farce. No wonder that it was both intended for American consumption only,¹ and that special efforts were made to keep it out of this country. But damning as is its testimony, it leaves much room for addition. We see daily how even in the skilful and tireless hands of Count Bernstorff and Hugo Munsterberg, with their cleverly audacious associates, it has utterly failed to hoodwink, let alone convince, the American people. Just as the Kaiser’s own special pleading with President Wilson has met with a dignified and well-merited rebuke. The reader may be left to study Mr. Sladen’s indictment for himself. Here we only assert that this country’s attitude has been, and yet is, misrepresented by a veritable campaign of German lying throughout the world. The lies are of the same order as the Kaiser’s mistakes, colossal, and far-reaching. That may be in part explained by their sources. Of these there are mainly four.

¹ In the Preface Mr. Sladen says—‘This book—*The Truth About Germany*—which has no title-page, or any other indication of its publisher or place of issue, has been jealously kept out of England, though it has been scattered broadcast in America, and handed to certain American visitors whom the German authorities thought they could trust as they left Germany.’ One cannot help wondering if the New Testament of these Theological Professors contained two verses in the Fourth Gospel found in chap. iii. 20, 21.

(i.) The Press Bureau. This covers a wide field, and includes the labours and influence of the two best-known journalistic giants in Germany, August Scherl with his *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, and Maximilian Harden with his *Zukunft*. Of this latter Mr. Wile says :—

M. Harden is to-day indisputably the commanding figure in the field of German polemics. No man now writing in the language of Goethe and Schiller has so large a personal following or so influential a voice.

For the general work and influence of the Press Bureau, with its wireless agency, the columns of the *Times* 'Through German Eyes' will supply ample illustration.

(ii.) University professors and teachers. Haeckel, Harnack, and Eucken here appear together as strange company, which, however, patriotism might justify, if their allegations were true. But they are false.

(iii.) Amongst the Theological Professors who have issued such a tissue of falsehoods one is amazed indeed to find the name of Harnack. But all the learning eminence of these 'Biblical scholars' cannot avail to make black white, or that which is false true. Let us take but one specimen. In the protest signed by many of them, addressed to this country, occurs the following :—

Unnameable horrors have been committed against Germans living peaceably abroad—against women and children, against wounded and physicians, cruelties and shamelessness such as many a heathen and Mahommedan war has not revealed.

Such an avowal, from such a source, becomes important enough to call for unmistakable estimate.

So let it be plainly understood that this allegation is *an unmitigated lie*. It is absolutely false in regard to the whole campaign of the Allies. No instances whatever of such behaviour on our side can be found. But when these same reverend authors go on to ask—

Are these the fruits by which the non-Christian peoples are to recognize whose disciples the Christian nations are?

one stands positively aghast at the downright 'shamelessness' of these protesters. Besides giving them the lie direct as to this their avowal, we may ask them, in turn—do they live in cellars, like the poor civilians of Belgium, that with such pious effrontery they dare to put this query, whilst the whole modern world calls down the vengeance of heaven on the doings of their compatriots? Have these learned men never seen a newspaper? Have they never heard of Louvain, Rheims, Senlis, Dinant, Aerschot, Termonde, Liège, Haelen, Malines, Maubeuge, and the rest, the lurid flames from whose burning homes have cast the blackest shadows Europe has ever known flung over it? Or can it be that they are so sweetly simple-minded that they have taken as pure truth the incessant lies of the Press Bureau, and the host of associated journals which have thus far misled the people? Well may Dr. Scott Holland¹ say :—

The appeal of the Evangelical ministers in Germany is one of the most pathetic utterances it has ever been our

¹ Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in his magazine, *The Commonwealth*. If the reader can procure it, he will be well repaid by the whole article.

sorrow to listen to. These good men have been beguiled into believing a downright lie. They actually declare that Germany was not responsible for breaking the neutrality of Belgium. . . . Why, in the name of God, have these peace-lovers allowed their rulers to be what they are? Why have they tolerated the policy, the diplomacy, which has made Germany a byword in Europe? Talk of German 'culture'! Here is a doctrine of Life which is destructive of the very elements of culture. It is like the swagger of a rather clever but very nasty hobbledehoy.

To be explicit, German lies have sprouted and developed in three directions. First, in cruelly false information to their own soldiers. Secondly, in equally lying representations to the German people. Thirdly, in false statements and avowals to the world at large. Each of these admits of overwhelming proof. When the awakening comes to the German people, there will surely be a heavy bill for damages for some one to pay.

By way of being here true, and not false, a few specimens may be given—besides those pilloried by Mr. Sladen—of the falsities which have emanated from the sources above mentioned. These are definite lies which have been unceasingly propagated.

(1) That Germany is fighting for her own existence against unscrupulous and jealous enemies. The facts above given make this lie lurid.

(2) That Great Britain treacherously entered into the conflict for her own aggrandizement.

(3) That this country has long shown bitter envy and jealousy against Germany, and has proved it in her naval programme. Whereas, again and again, it has been proved that it was Germany which was compelling the pace of Dreadnought building. The reader has only to consult Sir Edward Cook's

booklet to see the incontrovertible evidence of this.

(4) That the social condition of this country was one verging on revolution, and that the attitude of the Labour Party was utterly antagonistic to the Government.

(5) That Ireland, in particular, was burning to throw off the British yoke, and would side with any foe to England.

(6) That all the Colonies of Great Britain were restless and dissatisfied, and that India especially only needed a spark to kindle a conflagration of rebellion.

(7) That there was a strong feeling throughout the country against war and on behalf of Germany.

(8) That the general character of the English people to-day was decadent, and that they would fall an easy prey to a resolute and powerful enemy.

(9) That the behaviour of the Allies, and especially the English, towards both enemies and civilians was barbarous in the extreme. Numberless proofs of this appeared in the oft-expressed fears of German prisoners that they would all be put to death. They had been told so.

(10) In regard to France and Belgium, that the former was preparing to violate the neutrality of the latter.

(11) That Russia only represented a barbarous horde, whilst Germany alone stood for civilization and culture.

(12) That the modern world is conspiring against the Fatherland. Whereas the actual truth—both spoken and written so plainly that no unbiased

mind can possibly misunderstand it—is that ‘Germany’s swelled head’ is against the world. Only space is needed to give overwhelming proof hereof in quotation. It is quite enough to refer to Bernhardt’s book, especially also Dr. Reich’s volume.¹

(13) That—to quote from the book specially intended for America only—‘a few weeks ago not one human being amongst us dreamed of war.’ A greater lie was never told, with all respect to the forty-five intellectual men who are responsible for this book. Out of hosts of irrefragable proofs take one fact only, as pointed out by Mr. Sladen—‘Notices for mobilization had gone out already to Germans in South America in time to get them home for the war.’ That is, at least *two months before*. And all the time the great siege guns which wrecked Namur and Antwerp, were lying concealed in Krupp’s subterranean stores.

(14) But now, say the Evangelical Professors, ‘our nation is hearing God’s holy voice, and is turning to Him.’ And the proof of the turning is in the everywhere-displayed and growing venomous hatred of this country; in the feverish haste with which a vast fleet of Zeppelins is being constructed; and new Dreadnoughts laid down with the avowed purpose of invading and devastating these islands.

(15) The greatest lie but one is the unblushing attempt, in spite of facts known to every watcher of the last six months, to saddle upon the Allies

¹ Note the Bishop of Durham in *The Times* of August 17—‘About seven years ago I was a fellow guest at Trinity College with a distinguished soldier, who showed me before we parted a book to which his attention had been called by King Edward. It was *Germany’s Swelled Head*, by Dr. Emil Reich.’

the responsibility for 'the terrible crime of this war.' Well may Dr. Scott Holland ask—

Do they deliberately close their eyes and ears, these Christian theologians? They deliberately ignore the incident of the scrap of paper, and the fact that this violation of Belgian neutrality was the sole cause which compelled England to declare war.

Might he not also have said that they wilfully forget that their own Chancellor openly confessed before all the Reichstag, and all the world, that they were doing 'wrong,' and knew it; but that it was justified by necessity? Will these Christian theologians undertake to defend that principle? If they do, what becomes of their Christianity? If not, where is their honesty?

(16) The greatest lie of all is like the condition of the poor demoniac—'Our name is Legion, for we are many.' The total *falsification of actual events* during the last two months has been simply appalling, unparalleled in the history of warfare. For proofs the daily press is sufficient illustration. It is sadly, solemnly, frightfully true, that the general conduct of Germany during this fearful struggle has been and yet is a campaign of lies. Any cause that needs such help is doomed from the outset.

(7) *This Country's Part, However Costly and Tragic, has been, and yet is, truly Christian.*

Here is Bernhardi's conception and suggestion as to what are Christian efforts :—

From the Christian standpoint we arrive at the conclusion that efforts to secure peace are extraordinarily detrimental to the national health so soon as they influence politics.

Christian morality is based indeed on the law of love. Love God above all things, and thy neighbour as thyself. This law can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties. The love which a man showed to another country as such would imply a want of love for his own countrymen. Christian morality is personal and social, and in its nature cannot be political. It tells us to love our individual enemies, but does not remove the conception of enmity. Christ Himself said, 'I am not come to send peace on earth, but a sword.'

It is difficult indeed to read with patience such specious and plausible falsities—capped, as usual, by a distorted exegesis of a picked-out verse, regardless of context. 'A sword,' said Jesus, and the kind of sword He meant is made unmistakably plain by the words which follow. But true exegesis is nothing to the militarist, so he represents Christ as saying—'I am come to send the sword'—as represented in this volume of Germany's cynical self-conceit and apotheosis of brute force. Such a dictum is lying and blasphemy in one. The accompanying moral philosophy is too transparently absurd to call for comment. If this were Christianity, then some other words from the Gospels would have full application—'It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men.' Such Christianity, 'made in Germany,' may well nauseate the world.

Turning to words of truth and soberness, here are reasons for the above affirmation, viz. that the attitude of this country has been and is Christian, in truth and in deed.

We have seen above that the principle of peace-at-any-price—commonly called 'non-resistance'—is

not Christian. It was not the intention of Christ's oft-quoted words in Matt. v. 39; it was not practised by Him; it was neither taught nor practised by the Apostles; resistance to evil things and evil men is a main principle of Christian doctrine; the method of the resistance is irrelevant, and must be determined by the occasion; when the method is determined by evil men who have no principle but brute force, it may be quite inevitable to follow their method in order to disprove their principle; this is not 'doing evil that good may come,' for the moral quality of the doing is in the motive, not in the method; to have power to resist evil and allow others to be injured, is a cowardly neglect of Christian love; to permit them to be killed when it is in our power to save them, is murder; to have power to resist evil and permit oneself, for no sufficient moral motive, to be killed, is to commit suicide.¹

Passing from the negative to the positive aspect, four considerations make the present conflict in which Britain is engaged not only a Christian war, but the most Christian of any in this country's history. If those who cry out so loudly—and one does not doubt their sincerity—would but make a fair study of Dr. Mozley's discussion of the matter in

¹ Dr. A. Salter's attitude in the *Labour Leader* would serve as instance alike of the sincerity and the misleading superficiality and unfairness to which the opening words of the Apostle in Rom. x. 2 markedly apply. Take an outburst like this—'Look, Christ in khaki, out in France thrusting his bayonet into the body of a German workman. See the Son of God with a machine gun ambushing a column of German infantry and mowing them down in their helplessness. The Man of Sorrows in a cavalry charge, cutting, hacking, thrusting, crushing, cheering. No, no! That picture is impossible, and we all know it. That settles the matter for me.' Which may be. But what does that prove? That this writer is the only Christian, and that every one of our fellow countrymen who at such fearful cost during the last two months

his University Sermons,¹ or Dr. Martineau's *Right of War*,² together with Mr. Frederic Harrison's booklet on *The Meaning of the War*,³ they would at least find that there is, truthfully and impressively, another side, which should serve to make their protests somewhat more moderate and more charitable. Assuming the rightfulness as well as the necessity of resistance to manifest evil, these following features clearly distinguish the present conflict, on the part of this country:—

(1) It was assuredly not entered upon willingly, but under compulsion; in order to maintain life, truth, honour, liberty, with all those accompanying possibilities of love and gladness which alone make life worth living. War is in itself an immeasurable evil, even as is madness for a human being. But resistance to the uttermost is the only way to deal with a madman. To leave one's loved ones and all precious things—apart from one's own life—to the mercy of a raving lunatic bent on murder, on pious pretext that Christ would never have knocked any man down, is a wicked absurdity. It would be not only a specimen of cowardliness blended with madness itself, but a direct violation

have been staying the bloody tide of aggression with which the modern Huns would have devastated France if they could, were traitors to Jesus Christ? Assuredly not. His picture is bathos, not reasoning. And it is as false to Christ in reality, as it seems to be true to Him in appearance. But it is He who also said—'Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgement.' A careful study of the three authors named above, will suffice for any mind that is open to reason. If melodramatic superficiality is to be the tribunal for such far-reaching questions, then nothing is left but moral and spiritual as well as emotional chaos.

¹ Rivington, pp. 110–137.

² Longmans, republished, twopence.

³ Macmillan, one penny.

of one of His most plainly enunciated principles—
'Be ye therefore wise as serpents, no less than
guileless as doves.' The dove alone will never bring
to pass the kingdom of heaven upon earth.

(2) This war, for all its inevitable abominations,
was not entered upon by Great Britain with any
selfish motives. It is not for us, in any sense,
a war of aggression, or of conquest. The vituperation
of our leading statesmen by Germany is only
one portion of the venomous lies which have been
circulated in that nation since the war began; evidently
because the war-crew's plans have been so
bitterly disappointed through the action of Belgium,
with England's support. It is not too much to say
that besides the necessity of taking part in the
struggle on the ground of self-preservation, for
which there is no Christian need to apologize, the
compelling motive was to do what Christ Himself
claimed to inaugurate.

A crushed reed He will not utterly break,
Nor will He quench the still smouldering wick,
Until He has led on Justice to victory;
And on His name shall the nations rest their hopes.¹

Nothing less than that is the programme of the
Allies, and the part this country will take in it is as
noble and Christian as the costly manumission of
its slaves a century ago.

(3) The Apostle's vehement exhortation, 'Abhor
that which is evil,' is quite as real a part of the
Christian Gospel as the Sermon on the Mount. So
is the negative aspect of the purpose of our share
in the present struggle as truly Christian as the

¹ Matt. xii., 20, 21. (Weymouth).

positive. It has been said that this is a war for the preservation and maintenance of Christianity. There is this truth in such an estimate, that it is certainly directed on the part of the Allies against that utterly anti-Christian set of ideals which have been of late propagated by Nietzsche and his friends. We bear, as Christians, no more malice against the mad philosopher than David did against cursing Shimei. Nietzsche's curses upon Christian ideals will do them no harm. But his main ravings have done unmeasured harm to Germany, as above shown. They have afforded the rank soil out of which has grown the deadly upas-tree of militarism, which is a menace to any nation and a curse to civilization. To lay the axe to the root of that evil thing is a task entirely worthy of any Christian man or party. However paradoxical it may seem to seek to end war by means of war, it becomes alike reasonable and Christian when it is made so tragically plain that nothing else will avail. Dr. Inge said the other day in Westminster Abbey :—

We read our newspapers since the beginning of August, and we can see nothing but triumphant and unpunished devilry—the exploits of the self-styled apostles of culture who dare to claim the favour of the Christian God. We think of the horrible words of their accredited spokesman on the ethics of war: 'Cause the greatest possible amount of suffering. Leave to the non-combatants nothing but their eyes to weep with. The law of Christian love has no bearing upon the relations of one nation to another.'

It is too sadly true a protest. What, then, can be done with such 'devilry' but resistance to the uttermost? It were better not only that England should disappear from the roll of nations, but that

all Europe should sink to the bottom of the sea, than that this brutal, diabolical doctrine, that might makes right, should be allowed to curse the peoples that inhabit it. If any better day is ever to dawn upon this poor world, the worse than Egyptian darkness of the Nietzschean-Treitschkean-Bernhardian selfishness and pride, will have to be stamped out of nations no less than out of individuals.

(4) In some respects—though confessedly not for the first time—this war is yielding Christian fruit as the maintenance of peace could never do. The cost of such a Titanic struggle is indeed in every respect frightful. For the eight millions per week which it is now said to be costing this country, we shall have to pay hereafter in wearying burdens of taxation. But all that is only trifling, compared with the holocaust of the very lives which, for their youth and health and manifold powers, every nation must hold as its greatest treasure. For the loss of these, there can be no recompense, and no repair. The one and only thing which sends a shaft of heavenly light across this hell is the opportunity so nobly, so gloriously embraced by the sons of Britain, of giving themselves for holy duty, and yielding up their very lives on behalf of their country and the loved ones who dwell therein. This is the most Christian of all principles exemplified in these days of gloom. Such an ideal of heroic self-sacrifice does not merely come to us directly and emphatically from the Master's own lips, but it is the embodiment of comfort and glory for this country as for no other. Our soldiers are no slaves of a conscription, no poor heartless pieces of a military machine driven into battle by the swords and

revolvers of officers behind them. They are all free men, and only free men can 'lay down' their lives for others. As to how they have borne themselves the testimony of their worthy leader is alone sufficient.¹

We may boldly claim that however far some of them may be from perfection, no one single instance has been known, or can be shown, of any ruthless robbery like the abominable looting of the German hordes. Still less any one case in which woman or child has suffered anything, let alone the damnable villanies which have been perpetrated upon poor Belgian victims at the express command of the Bible-reading Kaiser and his cultured crew.² We Britons say, without any cant, but from our very souls, 'Thank God for that!' Our men will do their duty even unto death, but none of them will come home with the blood of murder on their hands, or the pollution of stolen goods as trophies of their victories. There is no need to say more. 'It's a long, long way to Tipperary' may not be the precise song which some Christian folk would have chosen—and there have been many others nearer

¹ In to-day's *Times*, October 21, occur the words of Sir Douglas Haig, himself a noble example—'We have had hardish times, but nothing in our history has surpassed the soldierly qualities displayed by the troops you saw at Aldershot last summer. They have marched and fought and suffered hardship in the trenches—first great heat, and now wet and frost—in a manner beyond all praise.'

² The following appears in to-day's paper, October 27:—'Rotterdam, Monday.—Messages from Brussels state that the German Government is thinking of recalling General von der Goltz on official grounds of ill-health and overwork. The real reason, however, is that der Goltz is considered too lenient towards the Belgians. A desire is felt in Wilhelmstrasse to send a younger general, who would be more in sympathy with the efforts of the General Staff. It is reported that some extra drastic measures were proposed, but Von Goltz refused to enforce them, thus causing the trouble.'—Exchange Telegraph Company.

those which untroubled congregations not seldom sing without a thought—but it is nearer the mind of Jesus Christ that they should sing that, and then go and do what He will never rebuke them for doing, than sing ‘*Ein feste burg ist unser Gott*,’ and then shoot and stab wounded soldiers on the battle-field, ravish women, torture children, murder old men, and come home laden with the loot from devastated Belgian homes.

We will leave all such devilry to the judgement of God. Enough to make this protest truthfully and solemnly, that Great Britain entered into this Akeldama with open eyes and a saddened heart; with no reproach of lying diplomacy upon her conscience, but prepared for the sake of truth, and honour, and compassion, to play the part of manhood, and, so far as it is possible, to do or bear all the miseries of body and soul that war entails, as He would have men do, in whose name we have begun and intend to finish. It is not mockery, nor cant, nor falsity, but warranted truth, to point to the Apostle’s words—‘Suffer hardship with me, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ’—as the main energizing principle of those who have gone with our prayers and tears to face the enemy of Europe’s peace and hope.¹

¹ The entrance of Turkey into the great European conflict, whilst these pages are in the press, only illustrates and confirms what has been said above concerning Germany’s sinister preparations for war. Every one knows how for years Turkey has been Germanized. But the failure of that country to stir up a religious war amongst Mussulmans throughout the world, is only pointer to the day when it will share the humiliation of the Kaiser’s hordes, and Mr. Gladstone’s fervent wish to see the Turk turned out of Europe ‘bag and baggage,’ will be at last an accomplished fact.

III

THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIAN PEOPLE
AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES DURING THE
PRESENT CRISIS

We have tragic assurances from Lord Kitchener, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill, and Mr. Lloyd George, that the war upon which we have been obliged to enter, will be no more brief than easy. It is to be, we are told, a war of endurance—may be for years. Very many of us will say ‘God forbid’; and venture, with Lord Rosebery, to hope that for once, our able and devoted Secretary for War may be mistaken. But certainly the end is not yet; and if Christianity counts for anything before such a terrible task is undertaken, it must continue to avail for all that is highest to the very end. In giving brief consideration to what is hereby involved, it is perhaps necessary to provide some answer to two questions which emanate generally from the enemies of Christian faith, but which are weighty in themselves, as well as causes of perplexity, if not depression, to those who still believe.

(1) We are asked, often cynically and sarcastically,

sometimes sincerely and reverently, why, if God is the Heavenly Father whom Jesus revealed, at once as good as the noblest fatherhood suggests, and as great as modern science insists, does *He* not intervene, and either prevent or put a stop to all the suffering and wrong, the sin and shame, which day by day turn the fair garden of Europe into the shambles of hell. Now it cannot but be plain to every honest mind, that such an inquiry, however sincere, is but part of the age-long problem of the mystery of evil, upon which perhaps discussion will never end. It were too much to hope, therefore, that a few words here will avail to settle it. Yet it must be owned that there is great need of some attempt, at least, at a better understanding, as against the meaningless platitudes of some believers, no less than the scornful denunciation of some unbelievers. Piety may be as blasphemous herein as impiety. Take this, for instance, printed with apparent sincerity in a well-known religious journal:—

O Thou by whom the deeds of men are weighed,
Who hast withheld the peace for which we prayed,
Forgive us if in aught our feet have strayed.

It is undoubtedly typical of numbers of other hymns, and homilies, and prayers. But it is false, even to blasphemy, all the same. It points sadly enough to the fact, illustrated in almost every Christian assembly for worship, that hymns are sung with sincerity and heartiness, by vast numbers who never face themselves with the meaning of the words they use. Here, for instance, is it true that God has

'withheld the peace for which we prayed'? If it be, then assuredly it is the Kaiser's God, and not 'the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Such a conception might be made to harmonize with the God of the earlier portions of the Old Testament or some of the Psalms, but certainly not with the New Testament, and 'the Father' of whom Jesus ever speaks. It would suit Bernhardi, doubtless, and certain Theological Professors in his land, but not the true Evangel of the grace of God which alone deserves the name Christian.

But it is not true; God, the Christian God, has *not* 'withheld the peace for which we prayed' and pray. That would make Him responsible for all the 'devilry' of which Dean Inge spoke. As this is not a theological treatise, and the discussion of Jonathan Edwards, J. S. Mill, and modern 'Determinism' must be left to other occasions,¹ brief assertion must take the place of prolix argumentation. God has not intervened to prevent or put a stop to this latest ebullition of hell, because He *cannot*. That truth must be put crudely first, for the sake of emphasis. But it bears, as well as calls for, the most reverent and thorough of philosophical or theological scrutiny. The old pseudo-dilemma that one yet hears not seldom—if God is good, He *would* prevent all this misery, and if He is omnipotent, He *could* prevent it all—is really only a puzzle for children. It is altogether too false, as well as too superficial, for grown men and women. As to 'would' on such lines no father would ever send his boy

¹ As, amongst other works, in *Determinism—False and True* (C. H. Kelly, London), and *Why Does Not God Intervene?* (Hodder) by the present writer.

away from a happy home to a boarding-school; and no medical man would ever inflict pain, no surgeon ever use his knife. As to 'could,' it is enough here to point out that omnipotence is not the power to do anything, as is popularly imagined, but only power to do anything that can be done. Until it is proved, therefore, that man is but what Mark Twain asserted, 'a machine and nothing more,' God cannot make him peaceful, any more than he can make him good. Goodness can no more be made, than a round square. Assuming here, as well we may, the real though limited moral freedom of human nature, it follows that man can no more be prevented from doing wrong, than compelled to do right. Either of these would involve a contradiction in terms. War is *not* 'the worst evil on earth,' after all; and if prevention of wrong-doing had been divinely possible, it ought to have taken place long ages ago, when human nature, as such, first emerged from the animal. Reversion back again to the non-moral animal stage, would be too high a price to pay, even to be delivered from the possibilities of such evils as both war and peace exhibit in modern civilization. Even in the midst of the present hellish chaos, a discerning eye can find the working of more good than ill. But, as Sir Oliver Lodge has well said,

Goodness would have no meaning if badness were impossible, or non-existent. We are not machines or automata, but free and conscious and active agents, and so must contend with evil as well as rejoice in good. Conflict and difficulty are essential for our training and development.¹

¹ *Substance of Faith Allied with Science*, p. 52.

Or it may be put succinctly, as Dr. Tennant does, that—

Responsibility for the possibility of moral evil, and for the opportunities for its realization, lies with God ; responsibility for the actuality of moral evil lies with man. If the notion of a moral being incapable of evil be a contradiction which omnipotence cannot realize, then the establishment of the possibility of sin, so far from being inconsistent with the love and holiness of God, is unquestionably its most adequate and indispensable expression.¹

The mystery and the explanation alike, of the immeasurable woe of the present war, are to be found not in God, but in man. And in the light of all we know, or may know, as to the origin of the outbreak, there is no difficulty whatever in tracing the responsibility, awful as it is, to the actual source. The only hope that can be cherished, is that the same nation whose moral freedom had power to trample on the true Christian ideals of Divine Fatherhood and human brotherhood, will come hereafter, through bitter suffering, to repentance and nobler expenditure of its wonderful energies upon worthier because more altruistic development.

(2) Another query often propounded, after the fashion of Haeckel, as a sort of unanswerable conundrum, relates to the contradiction involved in Christian prayers. We may leave both sneerers and hypocrites out of account, and think only of those sincere believers, on each side of the struggle, who pray earnestly for divine aid with a view to victory. When real Christians in this country entreat God to give us victory, and equally genuine Christians in Germany plead that their armies

¹ *The Origin and Propagation of Sin*, pp. 122, 139.

may triumph, the one emergent certainty is that both cannot be answered. What, then, say some, is the use of Christian feeling and intercession at all? Such queries are at least childish, if not generally also flippant. In so far as they are sincere, there is no difficulty in answering them.

(i.) The very first and surely sufficient thought is that answers to prayer belong to God to decide, not to us. It is our business to pray. It is His to answer. The God who is not capable of such discriminating sympathy, is not worth praying to at all.

(ii.) But in order that, so far as is possible, we may only pray for that which we have reason to believe He will be disposed to answer, what is required of us is that we should use all the means at our disposal, to ascertain on which side of any conflict those principles are obtaining which are in accordance with what we know of His nature and His will. That means, of course, reading and thinking, and watching, truly and fairly. To ask either a Briton or a German to do this without any bias, would doubtless be a counsel of perfection, unattainable. Still there are such things as facts, and plain principles admit of clear statement. It ought to be possible to distinguish between truth and falsehood, honour and dishonour, chivalry and savagery, covetousness and contentment, love and hate. There are now plenty of publications—a list of such will be found at the end of these pages—from the honest and earnest study of which there cannot but issue genuine conviction as to which side of this deplorable struggle has most right to plead for the sympathetic help of the Christian God. Sir Edward

Cook's lucid booklet on *How Britain Strove for Peace* may well serve as illustration. In concluding that summary the author truly says that three historical facts, 'in regard to which Great Britain took one path and Germany another,' are beyond dispute, and he asks in view of these—

In each case is it not clear that Great Britain sought the path of peace, and that Germany took the path which has led to war ?

That being so, whilst leaving all issues with God, we may pray with all our minds as well as hearts, that He will be with those who strive for peace, and 'scatter the peoples that delight in war.'

(iii.) In view of the tremendous interests at stake, and consequences which cannot but follow, it becomes a pressing duty of all Christian people and churches to employ all wise and worthy means for making known the real facts of the case and the vast issues involved. Our debt to the daily press may be gratefully acknowledged, and full attention paid to the many reliable publications which are within reach of almost all. But for our Christian purposes, that is not enough. When due regard has been paid to all national, political, commercial, and other such considerations, it is yet true that Christians have greatest reason of all for getting at the truth herein and making it known. For they have more at stake than any other. Besides the loss of liberty, and self-respect, and comfort, and hope, which would assuredly come with the triumph of brutal German militarism, there can be no mistaking the fact that Christianity also would

be doomed to extinction. Christ and Nietzsche could not possibly co-exist in human hearts and lives.

To think of harmonizing the ethics of the New Testament with the ideals of Treitschke and Bernhardt and von Bülow, to say nothing of the Kaiser and his fire-eating son, is as quixotic as to bring a pack of wolves to dwell in the same fold with a flock of sheep. It is most urgent that all the citizens of these realms should be enabled to detect wolves in sheep's clothing. The twenty-third chapter of our first Gospel supplies all needed Christian authority for efforts towards a true diagnosis.

Indeed the present crisis puts final force and emphasis on the protests which have now for some years been growing, in regard to the Gospel as generally related to human needs and affairs. Whatever may be said in some quarters which claim to be specially Christian, too much stress cannot be laid upon the principle that the message and mission of the Gospel of Jesus Christ are neither to be confined to 'saving souls,' nor helping men to 'get to heaven' hereafter, but have to do most urgently with the saving of the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, here and now, so that the kingdom of heaven may be definitely and firmly established upon earth. To this end the true man of God in the pulpit is discharging his spiritual function quite as worthily and truthfully, in dealing with all that concerns the weal or woe of the British Empire at this crisis, as in handling theological themes, or dwelling upon individual spiritual experience. It is easy to sneer at Christian ministers 'becoming recruiting-sergeants,' but it

is equally unworthy. Why should they not be such, when the issues at stake are all those fundamental realities without which Christianity itself would no more be possible, than life would be worth living? Can efforts at inducing the men of this country to take part in an inevitable struggle for life and liberty and truth and honour, be honestly excluded from the purview of Christian duties so emphatically and comprehensively urged by the Apostle upon the Philippians, as pointed out above?

The plain truth is that large part of the oft-lamented falling off of church attendance, is due to the lack of teaching which is so often painfully manifest in Sunday services. The men of to-day have to live a difficult life in the midst of strenuous surroundings, and in a troubled atmosphere. They need guidance, not as to 'going to heaven,' but as to the making of a heaven within and around them where they are. If the churches will recognize the legitimacy of their hunger for Christian truth, in application to the daily facts of commercial, social, political, national life, they will come to be fed. But they will not accept either theological stones, or pious airs, as food for mind or heart. The questions, difficulties, sorrows, anxieties, perplexities, struggles, which the present war-curse is putting upon us all, demand that Christian teachers and officials should show every possible sympathy, and make every contribution that can be wisely conceived, towards the enlightenment of the minds, as well as comforting of the hearts of the people at this dark hour.

(iv.) One element of such efforts towards the better day will be the inculcation, with unmistakable clearness and energy, of loyalty in all respects to a

holy cause, and the development of self-sacrifice for highest purposes, which are so essential if we are to come out of this fearful struggle on the side of victory. Our greatest statesmen have been the most earnest prophets of warning against taking the matter too lightly. We suffer, thanks to our noble sailors, so little of the cruel afflictions of war which have fallen direfully upon poor Belgium and France, that it is tragically easy to underrate both our dangers and our responsibilities. A sketch of Parisian life from the current issue of *The Times* may here be more instructive than many homilies:—

It is difficult to realize at first sight how completely in the hour of trial the traditional lightheartedness of the Parisian has been translated into a fine simplicity of courage and devotion to the common cause and to a high seriousness of patriotism. There is something splendidly impressive and stimulating in the spectacle of civilization's most sensitive culture suddenly confronted by the stern realities of a life-and-death struggle and responding unanimously to the call of duty. Without hesitation or complaint Paris has put away childish things, her toys, her luxury, and her laughter; to-day her whole life reflects only fixed purposes of united effort, of courage, never, never to submit or yield, and this splendid determination is all the more significant for being undemonstrative and almost silent.

And yet Paris counts as a godless city, where Christianity is at a discount. If that be so, a solemn and weighty task rests upon the churches of this country—which is said to be the most Christian in the world—to justify their profession, in setting before all the people, so far as in them lies, not only an ideal as lofty as that which manifestly moves the Parisians, but both a yet nobler standard of

self-sacrificing devotion, and the spiritual dynamic whereby that standard may be reached. So only will they bring, in this hour of stress and strain, the greatest possible blessing to the greatest number.

(v.) Such a standard will include more than the heroism which braces itself up for the worst in self-defence. Our great Exemplar said—‘It is more blessed to give than to receive.’ Poor human nature often finds it difficult to accept and act upon that axiom. But no less an ideal can be Christian. The scope for its present exemplification is all too manifest. Nietzsche condemned pity, and scorned sympathy as tokens of weakness. It is ours, in turn, to scorn his maxims, and turn afresh in heart and hand to Him who said, ‘Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.’ The spirit of that invitation is quite unmistakable—in Him who uttered it. So should it now be in all who in any degree bear His name. We may be thankful that it is. Whatever the faults of the churches, there is nothing on earth to approach their organized philanthropy. And there is neither measure nor end to the practical expression of tender sympathy which is now being extended to the innocent and helpless victims of the worse than brutal atrocities of the German Huns.

Never in this country’s history has there been such opportunity—and we may truly say never has there been such a response to opportunity—to play the good Samaritan, as during these last few weeks, when thousands of poor Belgian refugees whom the devilry of the mightier neighbouring nation has robbed of their homes and

their loved natural protectors, have been welcomed to these shores, and are being watched over by British hearts and hands. This spirit, and this real fulfilment of the far-reaching reminders of Matt. xxv., the Churches can foster and develop more than any other institution on earth. It is in very deed a tragic chance of fulfilling the Master's word—'Go and do thou likewise'; as also the Apostle's exhortation—'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.' There can be no doubt that the deplorable condition of the heroic little nation which dared to withstand the onslaught of the vast German hordes, and so lies crushed and bleeding in our arms, will need for a long, long time, all the help in every way that this land can give it. The suffering, the loss, the ruin, are immeasurable. So great must be the loving pity and the actual help of all whom Christian faith can move to the compassion which is merited. Some cases of fiendish cruelty seem almost beyond human comfort, but numberless others may be immeasurably soothed and helped by tender hearts and willing hands, working together under wise guidance.¹

¹ As, for instance, a young woman known to the writer, whose father, mother, brother, were murdered before her eyes, and in response to her cries for help both her hands were cut off by the German villains. In his lecture at Sheffield Mr. Hilaire Belloc told the vast audience of a case known to him in which a little child's eyes had been gouged out and all its fingers cut off. What one feels in face of such devilries fades away before the yet greater question, What can be done to bring comfort to such pitiable victims? That the Belgian refugees are not all angels but show sometimes tendencies to laziness, drink, quarrelling, is only what must be expected. It increases rather than diminishes the Churches' responsibility and opportunity.

(vi.) One other difficult but unmistakable Christian lesson here confronts us with special force, viz. the necessity to cultivate discriminating justice, even towards those who have done so much to set the whole world of modern humanity against them. All German soldiers are not fiends, nor all their officers brutes. We must try to forget sometimes the cold-blooded calculations of a Bernhardi, and the swollen conceits of a Treitschke, as well as the half-mad egoism of the Kaiser, with their disastrous influence, and think of some of the instances which we know, and the many, many others which we do not know, in which their officers have behaved with all war's chivalry towards prisoners, and soldiers have shown real brotherhood towards wounded enemies. We must never suffer ourselves to forget that amongst the German hosts there are husbands, and fathers, and brothers, and lovers, quite as true to their homes and tenderly yearning for their loved ones, as in our British regiments. Their case is indeed worse than that of our heroes, for they are compelled against their will to go to fight, whilst ours are at least all voluntary.

We have, moreover, to make ourselves realize, if we are to judge according to Christian principles, that there is a real 'culture' for which the world is greatly indebted to the land of Kant and Goethe and Schiller, not to mention a host of other genuine 'intellectuals.' There is a better Germany, as well as a worse. And more; whatever may be to us clear as the light of day concerning the responsibility for to-day's horrors, vast numbers in that great country and in its army, are sincere in their belief that we are the aggressors, and

that their Fatherland is fighting for its life. Lies may be very lamentable, but they are no less influential where they are taken for truth. We have no power to make any of them face the lucid and truthful summaries of Sir Edward Cook, and others, as to *How Britain Strove for Peace*. But in the absence of any such enlightenment, we have to deal with the most potent of all foe-making influences, the ignorant and therefore impregnable conviction that their beloved country is endangered through the hatred of the Allies in general, and of this country in particular. Alas, it will take much more than any 'smashing victory' on our part, to dislodge that conviction. We must at least ever discriminate between the teachers and the taught, between the gang with swollen heads and narrow minds who surround the Kaiser, and the host of sincere though uninstructed citizens who have been beguiled or cowed into false beliefs, both as to the mission of Germany and the attitude of the nations towards her.

(vii.) Probably to all of us in these realms, it is now still more difficult to cherish any but bitter and vengeful feelings, towards those in influential positions who unquestionably have been the actual causes of the European conflagration. If we heard that the Kaiser and his Hotspur son were killed in action, and that other of war's happenings had removed Bernhardt, as well as the whole clique that works with him, most of us would be only devoutly thankful. If we could, it is to be feared that some of us would make them suffer, before they departed, the same miseries which they have inflicted upon the poor Belgians. It would seem

only the just reaping of what they have sown, that presently, at the hands of ruthless Cossacks, their homes should be devastated, their wives insulted, their daughters ravished, their children murdered. It would be a ghastly recompense, and, humanly speaking, well merited.

But for the real Christian this is all wrong. Christianity stands for the superhuman, and this, alike in principle and in practice, is as contrary to Nietzsche's Superman as day is to night. The Superman would do as Professor Gilbert Murray says in the *Hibbert* for this month:—

Which is the way to attain permanent peace? Some would say, 'The war must not end until German warships are sunk, her fortresses razed to the ground, her army disbanded, her munitions destroyed, and the military and civil bureaucrats responsible for opening hell's gates are shot or exiled. As if that would bring us any nearer to a permanent peace! Crushing Germany would do no good. It would point straight towards a war of revenge. It is not Germany, it is a system that needs crushing.

But systems cannot be crushed by howitzers. Human battalions and machine-guns can no more compel in human nature the mind and heart that make for peace, than divine decrees can. The case is well summed up by Sir Edward Cook:—

The German Government by their deeds in Belgium and by their unmistakable words have plainly avowed their principles. That treaties are just scraps of paper; that a pledge to respect a little nation's neutrality is just a word; that military expediency knows no law; that a powerful military state is entitled to hack its way through a small nation whose neutrality it had bound itself to respect; that it may pillage and plunder any such nation which

presumes to defend itself. In short, that there is no Right but Might. On the maintenance of the opposite principles, for which Britain stands in this struggle, depends every hope of saving the world from the rule of mere brute force and militarism.¹

‘The opposite principles’—Yes, but how? Only by growing them from their roots. Whatever becomes of our philosophies, every one of us knows that Jesus was right when He said—

For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness. All these evil things proceed from within and defile the man.²

It is in the heart of each man and woman, each British citizen, that there must spring up the good seed that Jesus sowed when He laid down His general principle—‘But I say unto you, love your enemies.’ It is absolutely certain, human nature being what we see and know and feel, that in our midst evil will never be overcome by evil, with whatever might it be enforced. War such as this country is now driven to wage, is not evil. But it would become evil, and utterly defeat its own high purposes, if it necessitated or permitted the adoption of Nietzschean principles, either in the conflict or in victory. No nobler or more urgent duty, therefore, rests with all who deserve the name of Christian, than to cherish and spread abroad, so far as is in their power, that

¹ *Why Britain is at War*, p. 27.

² Mark vii. 21-23.

Christian spirit which resists evil to the uttermost, but recognizes in every enemy, and even every blackguard, the potentiality of a saint, and instead of saying vengefully with the Psalmist—'Blessed shall he be that taketh thy children and dasheth them to death against the stones,' learns to pray, with the world's sublimest Sufferer—'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

(viii.) This brings us to a commonplace which needs more notice than that accorded to it above, and indeed deserves more emphasis than any modern development in theology. The Gospels relate how on one occasion, in healing a savage demoniac, Jesus said—'This kind can come out by nothing save by prayer.'¹ That word is even more true and applicable to-day to the devil of militarism which—not in Germany alone—has come to dwell in modern civilization. It is certain that diplomacy, and politics, and statesmanship, even at their best, will not suffice to heal the wounds of Belgium or of France, or even of this country; seeing how many of our noblest sons are now taken from us, or left with us maimed for life by this cursed conflict. Nothing is left us wherewith to help to do so, but prayer and its accompaniments. The prayerful spirit is, with little or no exception, the source of the forgiving spirit. It may well be beyond us to trace out the objective results of even our intensest petitions. But the notion that prayer simply consists in getting all we can out of God, is pitifully false. True prayer is communion with God, and of that communion the 'kneeling and begging'—which the *Clarion* ignorantly and

¹ Mark ix. 29. The 'and fasting' of the Old Version is a gloss.

superficially represents as prayer—is but a minor portion. To pray is to be brought into such real fellowship with God—‘the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comfort’—that our minds and hearts become one with His. Then the rest of the Apostle’s noble ideal becomes possible and actual—‘That we may be able to comfort those who are in any trouble, through the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.’ That is the spirit, and that alone, whereby either any real healing can come to hearts that are now broken over loved ones lost, or minds that are so bitterly anguished at the sense of cruelty and wrong can be led to peaceful forgiving. Such is ‘the only way’ to any substantial hope that what is so often suggested—‘Never again’—may be realized.

(ix.) It goes without saying that the prayerful spirit is the practical spirit, just in the degree in which it is genuine. So that the more Christian people and Churches are truly given to prayer, the more they will be brought into active, actual obedience to Christ’s plain injunctions to pity and sympathy. With all too fearful truthfulness the victim whom the robbers in Christ’s lesson had left half dead with his wounds, represents myriads in this black hour. Not only are there multitudes of refugees flocking to these shores in fear and trembling, but numberless others in our own midst who, besides the loss of loved ones, which never can be repaired, have to face a future struggle with the hardships of poverty, which cannot be portrayed. It may be sadly true that some poor soldiers’ wives, lonely and dejected, have misused, in the

degradation of drink, the Government allowances which have come to them. That is no reason whatever why in hosts of other cases, where there is no thought of drink, widows and orphans should not be provided for as fully as they would have been by the husbands and fathers who gave themselves nobly for their country, and for us who, through them, have dwelt in safety.

The costs of the frightful business in which we are engaged, will be heavy indeed. But it should surely, if there be any fraction of reality in this realm's adherence to the Christian faith, be a first charge upon the nation's wealth, that those who have been entrusted to our care by the heroes who have laid down their lives for us, should not be doomed to poverty and all its pains, by an ungrateful people. The funds raised by the Prince of Wales's appeal, and for Red Cross work, are all welcome. But in the coming years, when the aftermath of to-day's horrors must be reaped, there will be need for more than all they provide, if those who deserve our tenderest pity are to have our practical help. In this respect the Churches have done far, far more than the world of scoffers has any conception. But there is, and will be, tragic room for thousands of Good Samaritans whose labours of love may be as blessed as unknown. The real emphasis of a true exegesis of Matt. xxv. has never been where most religious teachers have placed it, but on the everlasting principle—'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto Me.'

(x.) The suggestion is not seldom made that after all, when the agony is past, good may emerge even

out of this colossal evil. It needs to be said carefully. We shall do well to bear Tennyson in mind :—

Hold thou the good ; define it well,
For fear divine philosophy
Should push beyond her mark, and be
Procuress to the lords of hell.

In face of the dreadful facts, these last three words become a true appellation for those who have plunged Europe into to-day's Inferno. God forbid that the results of such bloodshed and ruin should be the 'good' which Treitschke, Nietzsche, and Bernhardt have defined for us.

War is a moral obligation, and as such an indispensable factor in civilization. The efforts directed towards the abolition of war must be not only termed foolish, but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race.

If that principle were to emerge from the din of this Armageddon, then it would be but one great curse giving birth to many greater. But there is no risk in saying that it will not be. This war is condemned already as no preceding war has ever been ; and its heaping up of deaths and wounds and horrors has so sickened the heart of humanity, as to prepare the way for some international arrangement which shall prevent the recurrence of such a curse.

Meanwhile, in full view of all the complications and difficulties which must arise in the future, as they have done in the past, every man worthy of the name, and assuredly every Christian, will desire

that besides such a negative benediction as freedom from the devilry of war, there should accrue some positive and abiding good from all the blood and tears this year has cost humanity. How can such positive good be attained? Only in the co-working of two great principles, viz. (i.) in setting up the very highest Christian standard, and (ii.) in ceaseless individual faithfulness to it. All that these involve cannot possibly be stated here. The signs of real good are, however, already in our midst. The cessation of political strife under the sense of patriotic unity; the world-wide revelation of the love of Britain's Colonies for the Home-land; the amazing solidarity of the British Empire; these are now manifest realities which cannot be underrated.

But even more precious than such results must ever be the effect, in some directions at all events, upon the mind and heart of the people. The growing sense of the seriousness of the situation, the appreciation of the vast issues which are at stake, have done and are doing in this land as really as in Paris, what unbroken peace might have failed to do. Besides affording opportunities for distinctive patriotism, they have emphasized general moral perception, real unselfishness, noble response to the call of duty, genuine self-sacrifice for others, appreciation of the ordinary blessings of our national life, and especially of the blessings of liberty. All these and many other effects of the painful tension under which we now move, are both real mitigations of the evil which cannot be denied, and grounds for hope that, however prolonged the struggle or tragic its final cost, it will not have been

in vain. The plague of militarism has been shown up; its lurid hellishness is no longer in doubt. When that is ruled out of the future programme of the nations, there will be both time and means for general social reform. Also, there will come an ever-growing desire and determination that for all human beings, of every clime and country, life shall be made far more worth living than it has been hitherto for uncounted myriads. The coming democracy will assuredly abolish war. But beyond that it will insist that each man and woman and child, as such, shall be freed from bondage, and given a genuine chance to make life as sweet and beautiful and happy as the Christian, at all events, is bound to believe is the will of God the Father of all, of Whom alone the Gospel speaks.

Here is the sphere, then, for individual devotion. It is utterly useless to deliver speeches, circulate books, and multiply pamphlets, about British freedom and brotherhood, if men and women day by day are to show the opposite to these moral qualities in all their dealings with each other.¹ In the development of moral and spiritual qualities nothing is trifling. The cholera horror which, alas, as these lines are being written, is laying low in Galicia

¹ Mr. Blatchford in the current issue of the *Clarion*, gives a painful instance, his own personal witnessing, of one opposite here mentioned, which deserves utmost condemnation. In Paris hotels he declares he saw British army officers refusing to speak to, or show any fellowship whatever with Indian Princes and officers—because they were Indians! If this should be in any degree typical of the treatment our Indian brothers are to receive at British hands, as the reward of their generous devotion it deserves not only to be pilloried as snobbery of the worst type, but to be stamped out by universal condemnation. We will hope that it was only exceptional. Even in the British army there are some black sheep.

thousands of victims in a day—so *The Times* reports—is the result of an infinitesimal infecting germ. And our ablest surgeons and physicians are increasingly insisting upon the necessity of inoculation as a preventive against the double scourge of both cholera and enteric. The analogy is fair and true. It is emphasized by all the wonders of antiseptic surgery which now give us back so many more of our loved wounded from the very jaws of death. Every medical man now knows and insists that prevention of disease, cure in illness, recovery from wounds, involve infinitesimals. To this principle even the mightiest hosts must give heed, if they are to do their work. It is even more true that beyond all public Meetings, and Conventions, and Acts of Parliament, must come what the Gospel of Christ insists upon most of all, the purification and ennoblement of the individual man. Upon this principle it is to be hoped the Churches are spending and will spend themselves more and more. There is no clash between such ‘spirituality’ and the being ‘wise as serpents,’ in regard to an understanding and appreciation of the times in which we live. ‘This ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone,’ covers the whole ground of opportunity and responsibility. In the degree in which those who bear Christ’s name are true, one and all, in everything, to His spirit—as Paul put it, ‘Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus’—we may hope, sooner rather than later, to miss the hell-boom of the guns, and hear instead the ringing of the bells which will tell once again of peace and comfort, with gladness and hope for mortal

men. So may we echo the well-known but ever noble words :—

Ring out false pride in place and blood,
The civic slander and the spite ;
Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold,
Ring out the thousand wars of old,
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand ;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A 022312

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

- (1) FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE. By Max Mugge. *Jack's People's Books*, 6d. net.
- (2) GERMANY AND THE NEXT WAR. Bernhardi. *Arnold*, 2s. net.
- (3) GERMANY AND ENGLAND. Professor Cramb. *Murray*, 2s. 6d. net.
- (4) GERMANY'S SWELLED HEAD. Dr. Emil Reich. *Melrose*, 1s. net.
- (5) MEN AROUND THE KAISER. F. W. Wile. *Heinemann*, 2s. net.
- (6) GERMANY'S GREAT LIE. Douglas Sladen. *Hutchinson*, 1s. net.
- (7) GERMAN ATROCITIES. William Le Queux. *Newnes*, 1s. net.
- (8) GREAT BRITAIN AND THE EUROPEAN CRISIS. *Government Press*, 1d.
- (9) GERMANY AND ENGLAND. R. Blatchford. *Clarion Press*, 1d.
- (10) THE GERMANS: (I.) THEIR EMPIRE AND HOW THEY GOT IT; (II.) WHAT THEY COVET. C. R. L. Fletcher. *Oxford University Press*, 2d. each.
- (11) (I.) WHY GREAT BRITAIN IS AT WAR; (II.) HOW GREAT BRITAIN STROVE FOR PEACE. Sir Edward Cook. *Macmillan*, 2d. each.

- (12) CAN WAR EVER BE RIGHT? Professor Gilbert Murray. *Oxford University Press*, 2d.
- (13) THE MEANING OF THE WAR. Frederic Harrison. *Macmillan*, id.
- (14) THE RIGHT OF WAR. Dr. James Martineau. *Longmans*, id.
- (15) PRUSSIA'S DEVILISH CREED. A. M. Thompson. *Clarion Press*, id.
- (16) IMPERIAL GERMANY. Prince von Bülow. *Cassell*, 2s. 6d. net.
- (17) GERMANY TO-DAY. Tower. *Home University Series*, 1s. net.
- (18) PAN-GERMANISM. Usher. *Constable*, 2s. net.
- (19) THE BLACK HOUR. Coulson Kernahan and Dr. J. Moulton. *Kelly*, 3d.
- (20) GERMANY AND THE GERMAN EMPEROR. G. Perris. *Melrose*, 2s. 6d. net.
- (21) WHO IS RESPONSIBLE? ARMAGEDDON AND AFTER. Ch. Brereton. *Harvap*, 7d. net.
- (22) THE KAISER AND HIS BARBARIANS. Willis. *Anglo-Eastern Publishing Co.*, 6d.
- (23) THE ANGLO-GERMAN PROBLEM. Dr. Sarolea. *Nelson*, 2s. net.

Printed by the
Southampton Times Company, Limited,
70 Above Bar, Southampton.

THE STORY OF SERVIA

Her Birth — Her Death — Her Resurrection

BY

LESLIE F. CHURCH,

B.A., F.R.Hist.S.

136 pp. Specially designed cover.

Price **1/-** net.

It is the purpose of this book to trace, if possible, the leading events in the history of the purest Slavonic race in the Balkans, and by so doing, to elucidate the principles which have led to its present honourable position among the nations.

Charles H. Kelly, 25-35 City Road and 26 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.

D Ballard, Frank, 1873-1931.
639 Britain justified; the war from t
R4 Christian standpoint. London, C.H.
B24 [1914?]
143. 19cm.

Bibliography: p.142-143.

1. European War, 1914-1918--Relig
aspects. I. Title.

CCSC/1

4 022312

